

CURRENT NEWS **EARLY BIRD**

TUESDAY, May 19, 1998

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. 1

Suharto To Relinquish Presidency

By Keith B. Richburg
Washington Post
Foreign Service

JAKARTA, Indonesia — Embattled Indonesian President Suharto told his crisis-wracked nation early today that he will remain in office only until a new parliament can be elected to name his successor.

Speaking to a television audience across the thousands of islands that make up the world's fourth-most populous country, the controversial 76-year-old leader said he could call new legislative elections "as soon as possible" and that he would "not be available" to serve as president afterward.

Under Indonesian law, an assembly made up of parliament and government appointees elects the president — as it has chosen Suharto repeatedly for a generation. The announcement means that Asia's longest-serving leader — he has held nearly autocratic power for 32 years — will not finish the five-year term the present parliament elected him to only two months ago.

Suharto did not say how

long the process would take, but some analysts said they believe it could require only a matter of weeks. Others said it could drag on for months, or even a year, depending on unforeseen political factors.

Suharto has been under relentless popular and political pressure to step down as the nation has floundered in its deepest economic and political crisis since he came to power three decades ago. At least 500 people were killed in Jakarta last week during bloody riots and looting sparked by government price increases — increases that were part of an austerity plan undertaken by the Suharto regime to qualify for an International Monetary Fund financial rescue package.

While the new elections are being organized, Suharto said, he will realign his cabinet to deal more effectively with the crisis. He said he would remain in office in the interim but that once the new parliament is in place he will "not be prepared to be elected anymore."

Only a day earlier, Suharto's political fate had seemed to

hang in the balance as the powerful speaker of parliament called on him to resign, while the head of the armed forces said such a demand was illegal and appeared to throw the weight of the military behind the president.

Monday's events indicated that the political ground beneath Suharto was rapidly eroding and that his final base of support was the 400,000-member armed forces. At the same time, the military leadership seemed to be signaling that as the country enters a volatile period of political uncertainty, soldiers — not legislators, opposition politicians or student protesters — would be the final arbiters of any leadership change.

In dismissing Speaker Harmoko's resignation demand, the armed forces commander, Gen. Wiranto, also said that militant students and other critics of the government should join representatives of the military on a new and undefined "reform council" that would help implement the mounting demands for an overhaul of Suharto's

government. Wiranto said the president's main task was not to resign, but to carry out a cabinet reorganization and begin implementing reforms to resolve the country's spreading crisis.

But any reforms that allow Suharto to remain in office were unlikely to be accepted by the student protesters, who became bolder in recent weeks as their ranks were swelled by academics, retired generals, former cabinet members and members of the general public.

On Monday morning, the students took their protest directly to the parliament building, where, after a brief stand-off, army troops allowed them to enter the sprawling grounds. They then proceeded to take over committee rooms and announced plans for a sit-in until the president steps down.

On Monday night, Wiranto urged protesters to call off additional marches scheduled for Wednesday, the anniversary of the birth of Indonesia's resistance movement against Dutch colonial rule. But Muslim leader Amien Rais, one of the government's most vocal critics and the organizer of the planned protest, said the dem-

Cohen At A Crossroads After Base Closing Loss

Secretary Can Act On Own, Or Cut Purchases

Washington Post...See Pg. 2

Indian Minister Warns Pakistan

Washington Post...See Pg. 3

Satellite Maker Gave Report To China Before Telling U.S.

New York Times...See Pg. 4



This publication is prepared by American Forces Information Service (AFIS/OASD-PA) to bring to the attention of key personnel news items of interest to them in their official capacities. It is not intended to substitute for newspapers and periodicals as a means of keeping informed about the meaning and impact of news developments. Use of these articles does not reflect official endorsement. Further reproduction for private use or gain is subject to original copyright restrictions. Please pass this copy on to someone else who needs current news information, then...



onstration would proceed as scheduled despite the possibility of violence, and he promised to bring more than a million people into the streets of Jakarta and other major cities. It was unclear what effect Suharto's announcement would have on these plans.

With the top military commanders openly siding with Suharto and legislative leaders calling on the president to resign, the country's political establishment seemed irreparably divided and headed for confrontation. "There's a split within the political machine of the regime," said Abri Sanit, a political scientist at the University of Indonesia. "The base of power of the president is becoming smaller and smaller."

Until today, and for most of the past three decades, that base had consisted largely of two key pillars, the armed forces and Golkar, the ruling political organization that controls parliament. As speaker of parliament, Harmoko — a longtime Suharto loyalist — is the country's third most senior official, after the president and vice president. So when Harmoko announced he was breaking

with Suharto and embracing student demands that the president resign, there was shock and euphoria among those who have been campaigning for months for the president's ouster.

"We will urge Suharto to resign for the integrity and the unity of the nation," Harmoko said, reading from a prepared text at a news conference in the parliament building, where hundreds of students had gathered for their sit-in. "The speaker of the house, along with his deputies, hopes for unity amongst the nation and that the president will wisely step down," Harmoko said. He said the leaders of the five factions in parliament — including the armed forces' faction — would hold an emergency meeting Tuesday to draft a formal statement asking Suharto to resign. As he spoke, he was flanked by parliamentary leaders representing the various legislative factions, including an appointed military members of parliament.

Harmoko's words drew cheers from those in the room and expressions of excited disbelief from students outside.

Many believed that Harmoko would not have taken such a dramatic turn without consulting the president. Many analysts asserted that Suharto had already agreed to resign and that Harmoko was making the announcement to give the president the face-saving "constitutional legitimacy" he needed to step down just two months after being appointed to a seventh five-year term.

"I think the game is over," said Eugene Galbraith, a longtime Indonesia analyst with the Dutch banking firm ABN AMRO in Hong Kong. "If in fact Harmoko has issued this call," Galbraith said, then Suharto is "dead in the water."

A series of late meetings between Suharto and his top aides took place, the military scheduled a news conference at the Defense Ministry headquarters later in the evening and television stations were told to be prepared for a possible statement from the presidential palace, leading to intense speculation that the president was set to announce his resignation after 32 years in power.

But this was confounded

when Wiranto, escorted by a number of senior military commanders, entered the briefing room and made his remarks. "The statement by the leaders of the [parliament] for President Suharto to step down are the actions and opinions of individuals," Wiranto declared. "In line with the constitution, this opinion has no legal basis." He said also that the views of Harmoko and the others at the news conference did not represent the view of all the factions in parliament, presumably meaning the armed forces' faction.

Wiranto's declaration sent shock waves across the city and triggered anger and confusion among the student protesters and others camped out at the parliament building. Some said they believed Suharto was masterminding some kind of complicated game, playing one faction off against the other, perhaps to give the impression that he was ready to resign but was being prevented from doing so by his military supporters. That anger and sense of betrayal threatened to boil over into more street protests this week.

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. 19

Cohen At A Crossroads After Base Closing Loss

Secretary Can Act On Own, Or Cut Purchases

By Bradley Graham
Washington Post
Staff Writer

After failing for a second year to persuade his former colleagues on Capitol Hill to approve more military base closures, Defense Secretary William S. Cohen faces one of the most vexing choices of his tenure: to begin shutting facilities on his own, or eliminate planned purchases of a new generation of fighter jets, ships and ground vehicles.

Having counted on an estimated \$21 billion in savings

from additional base closings to help finance new weaponry through 2015, Cohen has been left with a long-term defense spending plan that does not add up. According to aides, he has not decided how to proceed. But they said that the former Republican lawmaker, hired by President Clinton 1 1/2 years ago on the strength of his ties to the Hill, may have little alternative but to embark on a more confrontational course with Congress.

"The continued refusal of Congress to cut billions of dollars of wasteful spending on

unnneeded bases will force us to look for ways to compensate for the unrealized savings," Pentagon spokesman Kenneth Bacon said yesterday. "While no final decisions have been made, the options include trimming future procurement plans and looking for other ways to reduce the cost of excess facilities."

Cohen had hoped lawmakers would agree to revive the independent base closure commission that worked well during four rounds between 1988 and 1995, selecting nearly 100 large military fa-

cilities for elimination and generally shielding the process from political interference. He argued that the number of closures has not kept pace with the reduction of U.S. military forces since the Cold War's end and that more shutdowns are needed to fund a planned surge in spending following a decade-long slump in new equipment purchases.

But lawmakers, naturally reluctant to accept the pain of more closings in their districts, have questioned the Pentagon's savings estimates. They have urged waiting for the dust from previous closures to settle before proceeding with new ones. And they have pressed the Pentagon to find alternative

EARLY BIRD WEBSITE

The Current News *Early Bird*, *Supplement*, and *Radio-TV Defense Dialog* are available at <http://ebird.dtic.mil>. Read detailed instructions on the *Early Bird* "home page" or call (703) 695-2884 or DSN 225-2884. These electronic publications are intended only for DoD and .mil sites and cannot be made available to any other addresses.

ways to save money.

Adding to Cohen's uphill struggle has been a large residue of congressional resentment over Clinton's attempt during the 1995 closure round to enlist private contractors to save jobs at two Air Force maintenance centers in vote-rich California and Texas.

Cohen tried adjusting his proposal this year to make congressional distaste for closings a bit more palatable. Instead of pushing for new rounds in 1999 and 2001, as he did last year, the defense secretary moved for one in 2001 and another in 2005.

Allies in the Senate put forward a more limited plan, proposing one round in 2001 and taking the president out of the selection process altogether. But a majority on the Senate Armed Services Committee wouldn't go for that, either. The House National Security Committee declined to even discuss the issue. Although the matter still may come up for floor debate over the 1999 defense authorization bills, it is widely considered dead this year.

"I frankly don't see any means that we could succeed [with] any of the proposals that have surfaced," said Sen. John W. Warner (R-Va.). "This is not the time -- I repeat, not the time -- for the Senate to take up base closing legislation."

Whatever momentum Cohen may have begun to build in favor of more closings was badly undermined three weeks ago, when a Pentagon memo surfaced recounting a White House meeting April 23 on plans for closing McClellan Air Force Base near Sacramento, the California base that caused a problem for Clinton in 1995. The memo, written by acting Air Force Secretary F. Whitten Peters and addressed to Deputy Defense Secretary John J. Hamre, portrayed the White House as still eager to keep jobs in the Sacramento area.

Peters reported that White House officials wanted Hamre to encourage a major defense contractor, Lockheed Martin Corp. of Bethesda, to bid on McClellan's work and preserve the business in Sacramento. White House participants in the meeting disputed that account. They said that while there was

discussion of getting Lockheed Martin to bid in the interest of promoting fair competition, there was no insistence that the work stay in Sacramento. Hamre, whose assistant attended the meeting, also distanced himself from the memo, calling it poorly written.

But congressional critics seized on the memo as further evidence the administration was manipulating the base closing process. Voicing some of the loudest concern have been representatives from Utah, Oklahoma and Georgia -- states with military depots that stand to inherit some of McClellan's workload. But the allegations of improper political meddling carried wider resonance in a Congress all too ready to see intrigue and deception in the administration.

"Both sides of the aisle were really shocked by what happened in that California situation," Warner said. "To have written that memo in that way and at that time was just a crippling blow."

Warner, the second-ranking Republican on the Senate Armed Services Committee, said he has urged Cohen to continue working with Congress to draft new base closing legislation. What is needed, he said, "is a new statute that clearly prevents any repetition of the problems we encountered in California."

Cohen's aides said their boss will continue to fight to reestablish the Base Realignment and Closure process, known as BRAC. But they said he also has the option under existing law of moving unilaterally to

shut military facilities -- an option, they added, that could get the job done but would be politically messier than the BRAC route.

Cohen would be required to submit studies to Congress assessing the strategic, economic and environmental impacts of shutting each facility with more than 300 civilian employees. He also would run the risk of repeated legislative maneuvers to delay or block the closings.

In testimony before a Senate panel last week, Cohen was asked about the possibility of simply allowing some bases to "wither" by denying them upkeep. Cohen called this "the least desirable of any option for a secretary to exercise," saying "it would not be fair" to defense employees at these bases or to the local communities.

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. 15

Indian Minister Warns Pakistan

Sharpened Rhetoric On Kashmir, Spark For Two Wars, Follows Nuclear Tests

By Kenneth J. Cooper
Washington Post
Foreign Service

NEW DELHI, May 18—A week after India raised tensions in South Asia by conducting five nuclear tests, a cabinet minister warned regional rival Pakistan against trying to boost a separatist Muslim insurgency in Kashmir, the disputed Himalayan territory at the center of two wars between the nations.

The comments by Home Minister L.K. Advani, a hard-line leader of the Hindu nationalist Bharatiya Janata Party (BJP) who is in charge of domestic security, were among the toughest directed at Pakistan since the BJP-led coalition government of Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee took office two months ago.

Advani's remarks came as President Clinton and other Western leaders continued to urge Pakistan not to stage a nuclear test of its own in response to India's exercises.

For almost a decade, Muslim separatists in the Indian-controlled part of Kashmir -- the only majority-Muslim state in predominantly Hindu India -- have waged a violent but waning fight for independence

or a merger with Pakistan. Indian officials and foreign observers have charged that Pakistan has armed and trained some insurgent groups; Islamabad admits giving diplomatic and moral support but not material aid.

While India's previous government had a policy of not making hostile statements about Pakistan, the BJP as recently as two years ago advocated "reclaiming" Pakistan's portion of Kashmir. In the course of broadening its platform for this year's parliamentary elections -- and cobbling together a coalition government of 14 disparate parties -- such references to Kashmir were dropped. But Advani was pointed in his reference today to the disputed state, although he couched it more in terms of Pakistan's stance toward Kashmir than India's.

"Islamabad should realize the change in the geo-strategic situation in the region and the world [and] roll back its anti-India policy, especially with regard to Kashmir," Advani said at a news conference.

Vajpayee's declaration last Friday that India intends to build nuclear weapons, Advani said, "has brought about a

qualitatively new stage in Indo-Pakistan relations" and "signifies -- even while adhering to the principle of no first strike -- [that] India is resolved to deal firmly with Pakistan's hostile activities in Kashmir."

Since India's underground nuclear tests, Pakistan's leaders have been debating whether to conduct their own. Before last week, both nations had been considered undeclared nuclear states that were capable of assembling nuclear weapons but had not yet done so.

Pakistani Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan said over the weekend that it was only a matter of time before Pakistan detonated nuclear devices for the first time, despite diplomatic pressure from the United States and Japan as well as the threat of what could be damaging economic sanctions.

In London, President Clinton spoke by telephone today with Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif, making a direct appeal to Pakistan not to test a nuclear device.

Clinton, joined in the call by British Prime Minister Tony Blair, spoke for about 30 minutes with the Pakistani leader and laid out the case for not testing, but received no assur-

ances from Sharif, according to Press Secretary Michael McCurry. Sharif described "the difficult situation he faces" as he decides what to do, McCurry said.

McCurry said that Clinton and Blair "described the isolation that India faces in the international community as a result of having launched this test and suggested that Pakistan might emerge stronger and with an even better security standing if it elected to go the no-testing route."

McCurry said Sharif did not express the same concerns that some others have about the failure of many countries to impose sanctions or take other tough action against India because of its underground tests last week. Sharif "actually indicated that he was aware of the

very swift condemnation that had been made of India by other governments," McCurry said.

Before the call, Clinton held out the hope that Pakistan would benefit by not testing. "I'd like to talk to the Pakistani prime minister, not because I think I can pressure him into" not testing, he said. "I don't think for a moment I can do that -- but just because I would like to express my personal conviction about this in a way that I hope would allow them to think about it."

Japan's envoy to Pakistan, Siichiro Noboru, urged Sharif and Khan to refrain from testing, but said he failed to get any assurances.

"We didn't say clearly that we will suspend all aid," said Noboru, whose country is

Pakistan's biggest aid donor. "We share the concern held by the Pakistan government that the testing by India presented a serious threat to Pakistani security."

India's Advani spoke to reporters after meeting with Defense Minister George Fernandes. Chief Minister Farooq Abdullah of Jammu and Kashmir state and other top officials to discuss the development of new plans to counter the insurgency. Word has circulated in military circles here that the government has considered intensive "cordon and search" operations to capture foreign militants said to have crossed the Pakistani border into India.

Already, India has deployed several hundred thousand security forces -- including mem-

bers of its police, paramilitary forces and army -- to patrol Kashmir. Since the insurgency began in late 1989, at least 13,000 persons have been killed, according to the Indian government, a toll that human rights group say is higher.

Government counterinsurgency operations have quelled the violence enough to allow elections to install Abdullah's government in 1996 and to begin the first tentative moves to revive what was once a thriving tourist trade in the lush Kashmir valley and surrounding mountains.

Abdullah also took a tough stance toward Pakistan. "The time has come to show them our strength," he said.

Washington Post staff writer Dan Balz, in London, contributed to this report.

New York Times

May 19, 1998

Satellite Maker Gave Report To China Before Telling U.S.

By Jeff Gerth

WASHINGTON -- A leading American satellite maker acknowledged for the first time Monday that a committee headed by one of its top executives provided a report in 1996 to the Chinese on a failed Chinese rocket, without first consulting federal officials, and contrary to the company's own internal policies.

But the company, Space Systems/Loral, a subsidiary of Loral Space and Communications, based in Manhattan, said it "does not believe any of its employees dealing with China acted illegally or damaged U.S. national security." The company issued a two-page statement, which it called a "fact sheet."

In the statement, Loral said it was cooperating with the Justice Department, which is investigating whether sensitive technological information was passed to the Chinese during industry reviews of an accidental explosion of a Chinese rocket seconds after liftoff in February 1996.

The criminal inquiry is focusing on whether officials from Loral and other companies who participated in the review violated American export control laws.

Loral maintained Monday

that no secret or sensitive information was conveyed to the Chinese. But a classified Pentagon study concluded the review had helped Chinese missile capabilities and harmed American security, administration officials said. The Pentagon study prompted the Justice Department's inquiry.

In recent days, the Clinton administration's policies on Chinese-launched American satellites have come under intense scrutiny because of information that a Chinese military officer had funneled nearly \$100,000 into Democratic campaign committees during President Clinton's re-election campaign.

The New York Times has reported that lawyers and officials have said that Johnny Chung, a fund-raiser, provided information to federal investigators about the Chinese officer, Lt. Col. Liu Chaoying, who was a senior Hong Kong executive for China Aerospace. The Chinese conglomerate whose rocket exploded with a Loral satellite in 1996.

The information provided by Chung, which followed his pleading guilty to campaign-related bank and tax fraud charges, has re-ignited Republicans' zeal to investigate whether the Chinese government tried to influence Clinton

administration policy.

Speaker Newt Gingrich is considering creating a special select committee to investigate the transfer of advanced space technology to China, and House Republicans are threatening to attach amendments to the Pentagon's budget bill later this week that would bar the sale of commercial satellites and technology to China.

Loral's statement Monday said that "no political favors or benefits of any kind were requested or extended, directly or indirectly, by any means whatever."

It also said that the company's chairman, Bernard Schwartz, who has been one of the largest individual Democratic Party donors in the last few years, "was not personally involved in any aspect of this matter."

In outlining its involvement with the Chinese rocket, Loral's statement said insurance companies asked Loral and other satellite concerns, including the Hughes Electronics Corp., to review the results of an accident investigation done by the Chinese.

The outside review was headed by a senior executive at Space Systems/Loral. The review committee's report shows that the senior Loral executive

had been requested by the president of China Aerospace, which controls China's satellite and space enterprises.

In the end, the review committee affirmed what the Chinese found: "that a failed solder joint was the most likely cause of the failure," Loral said Monday.

Loral also said that while the 1996 review was under way, unidentified Loral officials "discussed the review committee's work with a number of U.S. officials interested in China's space program." But the company acknowledged that it had not followed its own procedures.

"Contrary to SS/L's own internal policies, the committee provided a report to the Chinese before consulting with State Department export licensing authorities," Loral said without elaborating.

The company has privately told investigators in a report that Loral's security advisers had told the company to seek State Department approval before talking to the Chinese but those instructions were not followed, industry executives and federal officials said.

Loral has privately conceded another mistake: ignoring license conditions that required Pentagon monitors during the transmission of any

information, the executives and officials said.

Last February, President Clinton approved the Chinese launch of another Loral satellite. That license, according to American officials, explicitly requires separate government approval to participate in any accident review and contains stringent safeguards against transfer of any technology. Administration officials have said that being under investigation was insufficient grounds to deny Loral a license.

But the Justice Department opposed the recent presidential

approval for Loral's license, officials said. Department lawyers feared that the approval would undercut the viability of a criminal case -- if one were to go forward -- by creating the appearance for a jury of government support for Loral's previous conduct.

Law-enforcement officials also had initial concerns about some of the licensing language, but those concerns appear to have been allayed as the inquiry is going forward, officials said.

The expertise needed to put satellites into orbit is similar to that used to deliver nuclear

warheads. The overlapping commercial and military uses lie at the heart of both the criminal inquiry and congressional concern about Clinton's policies on satellite launches in China.

On Capitol Hill Monday, senior Republicans continued to call for a broad investigation into whether the transfer of space technology to China threatened United States security.

Gingrich Monday called on Clinton to delay his trip to China in June.

The Speaker is also proposing the creation of a special

committee, with five Republicans and three Democrats, and headed by Rep. Christopher Cox, R-Calif., who served as deputy counsel in the Reagan administration, said Christina Martin, Gingrich's spokeswoman.

"The purpose would be to assess whether U.S. policy was affected by Communist Chinese efforts," Ms. Martin said.

But Rep. Richard A. Gephardt of Missouri, the House democratic leader, argued that the House had several standing committees that could handle the task.

USA Today

May 19, 1998

Pg. 10

Report: Chinese admit giving to Democrats

Officials in Beijing acknowledged for the first time that Chinese money, even if not directly tied to the communist government, went into Democratic coffers, *The Christian Science Monitor* reported today. State-owned China Aerospace Corp. admitted a senior executive gave nearly \$100,000 to Democratic Party fund-raiser Johnny Chung in 1996, but denied the funds were part of a government conspiracy to influence the Clinton administration's foreign policy, the newspaper report-

ed. The donation "was done by Liu Chaoying acting as an individual," Zhang Libul, a spokeswoman for China Aerospace, told the *Monitor* in Beijing. Chung has told Justice Department investigators that \$100,000 he gave the Democratic Party came from the Chinese army and was funneled to him through Liu, an army officer and aerospace official. House Speaker Newt Gingrich urged President Clinton to postpone his June trip to China until the Justice Department determines whether two U.S. companies gave sensitive missile information to Beijing in 1996. A spokesman said the speaker may set up a special committee to look into administration actions in granting the export of satellite technology to China. The administration has said the exports were approved under strict security provisions.

Washington Times

May 19, 1998

Pg. 1

China's influence on Clinton to be probed, Lott says

Did deals push India into tests?

By Nancy E. Roman
and John Godfrey
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott said yesterday that Congress will investigate charges that money funneled by the Chinese government into Democratic campaign coffers influenced President Clinton's decision to approve technology transfers to China.

The Mississippi Republican also suggested that giving China satellite technology might have prompted India to conduct a series of nuclear tests last week that have roiled South Asia.

"We are very much alarmed by the passing of technology to China that helps their satellite and therefore their missile technology," Mr.

Lott said.

"There are very legitimate questions about how that decision was made, how that has strengthened China's hand and, of course, did campaign contributions affect that in any way," he said.

Mr. Clinton's decision to approve the export of satellite technology to China allowed two U.S. space firms — Loral Space and Communications Inc. and Hughes Electronic Corp. — to export satellites to be launched on Chinese

rockets.

The Justice Department is probing whether Mr. Clinton's decision was in any way related to \$600,000 in contributions from Loral Space to the Democratic Party.

Briefing reporters yesterday, Mr. Lott wondered aloud if the satellite accord had "contributed now to the problem in the whole region."

"Did the additional technological capability by China, for example, cause India to begin taking more actions?" he asked.

Mr. Lott's linking yesterday of the Chinese technology sales and the Indian nuclear blasts came as China's official media assailed India for the test and a top Indian official labeled China his country's top military threat.

China's Xinhua news agency said that by citing a threat from China as a reason for the tests, the Indian government of Prime Minister Atal Bihari Vajpayee was putting forward "lame excuses."

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle acknowledged many unresolved questions about Chinese influence in U.S. campaigns but said the Justice Department investigation is sufficient.

"There are a lot of unanswered questions that have to be resolved, and I think the best way to resolve them is with a complete investigation on the part of the Justice De-

partment," he said.

Mr. Daschle said a congressional probe is not appropriate unless it is linked to legislation aimed at revamping the federal election law that governs the way campaigns are financed.

"If the Republican leadership and Republican members are unwilling to move campaign reform, then I don't think hearings are productive," he said.

Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan of New York is the only Democrat so far to call for an independent counsel to investigate the charges.

Mr. Moynihan has said the evidence suggests an attack on the U.S. political system by the Chinese.

"And we'd better find out about it, and the best way to do it is an independent counsel," he said. "I still think that."

Republicans see an opportunity to resuscitate the flagging campaign-finance investigation. The Senate hearings have concluded and the House probe has erupted into a bitter partisan debate over the approach and tactics of House Government Reform and Oversight Committee Chairman Dan Burton, Indiana Republican.

But the new reports of a possible quid pro quo involving Chinese money and satellite technology have proven explosive on Capitol Hill. Even Democrats have gone out of their way to criticize it.

If evidence emerges of a quid pro quo, "the person should be indicted and put in jail no matter who it is," said Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., Delaware Democrat and ranking minority member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

Sen. John Glenn, Ohio Democrat, who is retiring this year, said he expects more to "come out on this yet."

"I hope the Justice Department continues just as hard as they can on this thing," he said. "I want everything to come out with regard to this."

The official Democratic Party line offers campaign-finance reform as the solution to any improprieties uncovered in the investigation.

"I believe we need to get to the bottom of that, but we have about seen our fill of independent counsels," said Sen. Frank R. Lautenberg, New Jersey Democrat, adding that the issue raises a need for

campaign-finance reform.

Sen. Edward M. Kennedy of Massachusetts seemed resigned to a new round of investigations by congressional committees.

"We'll see what they recommend," he said with a shrug.

Republicans were more aggressive, seeing in the potential scandal an opportunity they can exploit in the November congressional elections.

House Speaker Newt Gingrich called the allegations chilling and has said Mr. Clinton should not go to China next month until he answers "serious questions," a view echoed by Sen. Tim Hutchinson, Arkansas Republican.

"It is inconceivable to me how you could go forward with your planned June 24th trip to China," Mr. Hutchinson said in an appeal to Mr. Clinton. "The cloud now brewing over your administration's relationship with the leadership of the People's Republic of China makes suspect any agreements that may be reached or any statements that may be made at this summit."

• Sean Scully contributed to this report.

Analysis

New York Times

May 19, 1998

Experts Greet India's H-Bomb With Suspicion

By William J. Broad

Big claims require big evidence to back them up. That is a rule of thumb in science and, for that matter, in many fields.

On Sunday, India made a big claim. It said, finally, flat out, that one of the nuclear devices it exploded in a series of tests last week beneath its northwestern desert was a true hydrogen bomb, in theory allowing it to make arms of virtually unlimited destructiveness.

Now the emerging debate among experts is whether India has the evidence to back up this claim and, if so, what the implications may be for weapons, politics and the world. For Pakistan and China, and stability in the tense region, the H-bomb issue is crucial. But already scientists and weapon experts say that India's announcements are rich in mysteries, and that the evidence it has so far presented is insufficient to clear them up.

"The whole thing sounds odd," Herbert York, a former nuclear bomb designer and

director of Pentagon research, said Monday of India's H-bomb claim. "It's not odd enough to make me say it's not true. But it's still a very strange story."

Vipin Gupta, an arms-control expert at Sandia National Laboratories, one of the United States' centers for research on nuclear weapons, urged caution in evaluating India's nuclear claims, noting that the nation in the past appears to have overstated the power of its first atom blast. "You have to have a healthy degree of skepticism," Gupta said. "We've heard so many conflicting accounts."

For nuclear-weapons experts, the current situation is fast becoming a detective story as they sort through the various clues and possibilities to make sense of the H-bomb enigma.

Shiv Mukherjee, press minister at the Indian embassy in Washington, said he could make no comment on the analyses, and could not even suggest that some of India's declarations might be exaggerated or false. "The experts will have to have their expert say,"

he said.

In interviews, analysts noted that a major reason for caution is the cloud of uncertainty around India's first detonation, in 1974. Indian experts claimed that it had a force equal to 15,000 tons of high explosive, or about the same as the atomic bomb dropped in 1945 on Hiroshima. But over the years, press reports and expert opinion reduced the estimate to as low as 2,000 tons, or less than one-seventh as big.

"They definitely hyped it the first time around," said George Perkovich, director of the Secure World Program at the W. Alton Jones Foundation, in Charlottesville, Va., and author of "India's Nuclear Bomb," to be published next year by the University of California Press.

Last week, 24 years after that first blast, India stunned the world by announcing that it had conducted a series of nuclear explosions, three on Monday and two on Wednesday, shattering a global moratorium on such detonations.

Indian officials at first gave

few details. Monday's tests were said to be "a fission device, a low-yield device and a thermonuclear device," meaning that it burned hydrogen fuel and thus had more punch than an atom bomb. Wednesday's tests were said to be "subkiloton," meaning their force was less than 1,000 tons of high explosive.

In weaponry, "thermonuclear" is an ambiguous term. It can refer either to a small atom bomb that burns a bit of hydrogen fuel to raise its power as much as 10 times, or to a true hydrogen bomb that can be hundreds or even thousands of times as strong.

In the first thermonuclear method, the core of a small atom bomb is filled with hydrogen fuel. In the second, the secret is to harness the radiation from an exploding atomic bomb and use that to compress and heat a packet of hydrogen fuel located nearby, igniting the fusion of hydrogen into helium.

Achieving this heating was the breakthrough made in 1951 by Stanislaw Ulam and Edward Teller, the fathers of the hydrogen bomb. Their solution was a jacket of complex materials that for a split second focused

the radiation from the exploding atom bomb onto the hydrogen fuel before the whole assembly disappeared in a titanic blast.

In theory, the amount of hydrogen fuel ignited by this two-stage method has no limit, making it potentially a weapon of terrifying force. But putting the bomb atop a missile leads to practical limitations.

The United States' first hydrogen bomb, a behemoth exploded in 1952, was about 700 times more forceful than the atomic bomb dropped on Hiroshima. In 1961, Russia exploded one that was about 4,000 times more forceful. In military circles, hydrogen bombs are known as city-busters, and their less potent kin are often looked down on as weak and inferior.

In the past, nuclear powers have usually taken the first thermonuclear step before the second, climbing a small mountain before tackling Everest. Last week, the evidence suggested India had done the same. The global network of seismometers that monitor the Earth for repercussions from earthquakes and atomic blasts had picked up only one faint rumble at the Indian test site, on Monday.

Its power seemed equal to about 25,000 tons of high explosive, or about twice that of the Hiroshima bomb. That is quite small for a true hydrogen bomb, so most experts assumed that India's "thermonuclear device" was simply a boosted atom bomb.

On Sunday, however, a team of Indian scientists came out of the shadows to say their creation was in fact a true hydrogen bomb.

"We could have got much higher yields," Dr. Rajagopal Chidambaram, chairman of the Indian Atomic Energy Commission, told reporters. "We were limited by possible seismic damage to the villages."

The scientists said the blast's power was actually equal to 43,000 tons of high explosive - nearly twice as high as the world estimate but still falling well short of proving that the device was a true hydrogen bomb.

In fact, its power suggested otherwise. The United States' first boosted atom bomb, deto-

nated in May 1951, had a power of 46,000 tons -- virtually identical with the Indian test.

Sunday's announcement held other mysteries, experts say. A main one was the lack of any news about a boosted-atom test, the first logical step on the hydrogen-bomb road and a crucial development if a hydrogen bomb is to be easily deliverable. Regular atom bombs are considered too heavy for the triggering job, especially if the H-bomb is to ride atop a missile.

Some weapons experts said the two tests Wednesday may have been failed boosting tests. An Indian news release said the blasts had a power of between 200 tons and 600 tons of high explosive, or quite small.

"Maybe they tried and failed," said Ray Kidder, a

former bomb designer at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, in California.

York, the former arms designer, who once directed the Livermore lab, said very small blasts made little or no sense. "It's a funny thing to do at this stage" of India's atomic evolution, he said.

The experts agreed that the Indian claims, if true, could add up to the prospect of the developing nation creating a usable - if heavy -- hydrogen bomb of devastating force.

"Anybody here would say you need to do some more testing to get it weaponized," said York. But he added that the goal moved much closer to reality if the hydrogen bomb were to be delivered not by a missile, where every ounce is critical and experts constantly struggle to lighten payloads, but by truck or airplane.

Kidder agreed. "If what they claim is true," he said, "it is very, very likely that they could develop a hydrogen bomb of any size they want. The only caveat is that with their present technology, it might not be as light as those in the American arsenal."

Some experts say that the Indian claims should be taken at face value, and that last week they probably did achieve a string of nuclear successes.

"They're pretty smart guys," said Harold Agnew, former director of the Los Alamos National Laboratory, the birthplace of the bomb in New Mexico. "The tests will give them confidence" about how to make a wide variety of nuclear warheads, including an assortment of hydrogen bombs.

"If you can do a little one," he said, "you can do big ones."

New York Times

May 19, 1998

Chinese Assurances Could Avert Pakistani Nuclear Testing

By Stephen Kinzer

ISLAMABAD, Pakistan -- A high-level Pakistani delegation arrived in Beijing on Monday, and analysts here said that China might give Pakistan the defense assurances it needs to refrain from responding to India's recent nuclear tests with tests of its own.

Foreign diplomats in Islamabad, the capital, said in interviews on Monday that China had suddenly emerged as the pivotal factor in Pakistan's wrenching decision. China is a traditional friend of Pakistan and reportedly the source of most of its nuclear technology and material. Both countries also share a fear of India.

"The delegation that was sent to China is very high level, and it is going not so much for consultations as to receive instructions," a foreign ambassador said here. "The Chinese can offer what no other country can offer, which is a public guarantee that they will reduce India to ashes if India dares to attack Pakistan. If they make this offer, which we should know fairly soon, there will be no need for Pakistan to test its own nuclear weapons."

Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif has also named a delegation to visit European capitals and another to travel to Washington. Foreign diplomats here said they doubted that Pakistan would begin testing before the delegations returned in a week or so.

"It's a good sign," a European ambassador said. "I'd have a hard time seeing them doing something while these envoys are still out there."

In Washington, U.S. officials said on Monday that Pakistan had completed all the necessary preparations for a nuclear-weapons test. The officials, who insisted on anonymity because, they said, they were basing their comments on fresh intelligence reports they had received Monday, added that Pakistani military officers and nuclear-weapons scientists were at the ready and could detonate a bomb on a few hours' notice whenever their political leaders gave the go-ahead.

Although no official announcement has been made, diplomats also said there were indications that Sharif would soon leave on a tour that would take him to China and several

Middle Eastern countries.

President Clinton and the British prime minister, Tony Blair, made a joint telephone call from London to Sharif on Monday to make a case for Pakistan to refrain from testing. Mike McCurry, the presidential press secretary, told pool reporters aboard Air Force One. McCurry said that Sharif had made no commitments.

In another sign of the role that world opinion may play in Pakistan's decision, a special envoy of Prime Minister Ryutaro Hashimoto of Japan met Sharif on Monday. The envoy, Seichiro Noboru, said before the meeting that Japan, Pakistan's main trading partner and aid donor, hoped to defuse the "highly dangerous situation" created by the specter of nuclear competition between India and Pakistan.

As senior Pakistani officials meet with foreign leaders here and abroad, other delegations named by Sharif are visiting Pakistani cities for meetings with leaders of political parties and civic groups. Aides said that Sharif wanted to determine whether there was a national consensus on entry into the nuclear club.

Finding a consensus will be difficult not only because of divisions in public opinion, but also because many Pakistanis are of two minds. Opposition leaders, however, are intensify-

ing demands that the government begin testing immediately.

Leaders of more than 30 opposition parties, many of them religious oriented, have held a series of meetings in Karachi over the last few days and have announced that they will call for demonstrations this month to demand tests.

"The defense of Pakistan cannot be left to the mercy of other countries," Abdus Attar Khan Niazi, head of an influential party and an organizer of the meetings, said. "The government must show the world that Pakistan is capable of defending itself."

The most prominent opposition figure, former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, who is planning to return to Pakistan this week despite threats that she will be arrested on charges of corruption, has warned that Pakistan will face war with India over the disputed province of Kashmir if it does not produce a nuclear deterrent in a few weeks.

Ambassadors from European countries held a meeting here on Monday to discuss steps that they might take to help dissuade Pakistan from nuclear testing. They decided to ask their governments for

permission to approach opposition leaders and urge them to stop demanding tests.

"More ambassadors think they will test than not, but there is still hope, especially if there is a strong signal from Beijing," said a European envoy who attended the meeting Monday. "It would be very positive if we could get these opposition leaders, plus the foreign minister, to stop putting pressure on the government to detonate a bomb."

Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan has been asserting that a Pakistani nuclear test is all but certain, seemingly contradicting Sharif's statements

that no decision has been made. A spokesman for the Foreign Ministry, Tariq Atlat, appeared to support the prime minister's position in an interview on Monday, asserting that Pakistani leaders "are not making a decision in haste" and will "take into consideration all factors that must go into this decision."

Some analysts here say that Ayub Khan is making headline statements to position himself for political campaigns as a militant nationalist. Others say they think that he is trying to pressure Sharif into ordering a nuclear test.

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. 22

Communists Seen Blocking Yeltsin On START II Ratification

By David Hoffman
Washington Post
Foreign Service

MOSCOW, May 18—Despite President Boris Yeltsin's renewed pledge to push for ratification of the START II nuclear arms accord, the agreement still faces hostility and delays at the hands of Communists and nationalists who control the lower house of the Russian parliament.

Parliamentary sources said today that hopes for ratification this spring have faded. It now appears a further delay is likely, perhaps until fall. The Kremlin said Yeltsin will take up the issue with the legislative leadership this week, after he promised President Clinton over the weekend at the Group of Eight summit of leading industrialized nations in Birmingham, England, to try to get the treaty approved.

Clinton has said he will not attend a Moscow summit with Yeltsin until the treaty is ratified and has promised quick movement toward a START III agreement after ratification. Clinton last met in Russia with Yeltsin more than two years ago. One year ago, at their meeting in Helsinki, Yeltsin also promised to push for ratification, but little happened. The treaty was signed in 1993 and has been ratified by the U.S. Senate.

Communist Party leader Gennady Zyuganov reiterated his opposition to ratification today. "Now that the country's

defense complex and armed forces have been ruined, we cannot eliminate the last nuclear shield," he told reporters. He controls the largest bloc of votes in the State Duma, the lower house.

Ultrationalist politician Vladimir Zhirinovskiy also predicted today that the treaty will have rough sledding in parliament, although it may get a hearing in the spring session. "START II will not get through, despite Boris Yeltsin's optimistic statements at the G-8 summit," he said.

Duma officials said prospects for the treaty, which would approximately halve both sides' strategic nuclear arsenals from the START I

levels, had been promising earlier in the spring. But the fight Yeltsin waged with parliament over approval of Sergei Kiriyenko as prime minister left a bitter taste among the Communists and nationalists, they said.

"In the nearest future, the treaty doesn't have any chance," said a Duma official familiar with the treaty. "If there were political will, it could be put to a vote now. But there is no political will. Every chance was lost in April when Kiriyenko was approved."

Yeltsin prevailed over his opponents on Kiriyenko, narrowly winning confirmation on the third ballot. "The deputies were cornered when they were

approving Kiriyenko, and now they will try to make up for what they have lost," by stalling on START II, the official said.

The treaty's backers had tried this week to persuade the Duma to create a single committee to streamline consideration of the agreement, but were defeated. Now, the treaty has to be considered separately by three committees.

Military leaders have been outspoken in urging the Duma to ratify the treaty, saying that Russia cannot afford a new arms race with the United States and that START II would keep both sides at lower levels of arms.

New York Times

May 19, 1998

Major Powers To Ease Sanctions As Milosevic Starts Kosovo Talks

By Reuters

LONDON -- Major powers agreed Monday to ease sanctions on Yugoslavia after President Slobodan Milosevic began talks with ethnic Albanians to try to reach a settlement to the crisis in Kosovo.

The British Foreign Office said the six-nation "contact group" in charge of monitoring peace activities in the Balkans would not put into effect a Western ban on new investment in Serbia that was announced on May 9.

"They agreed that the pro-

posed measure to stop new investment in Serbia would not be put into effect," a Foreign Office statement said.

Kosovo has been hit by unrest between Serbs and ethnic Albanians, who make up 90 percent of the population of the southern Serbian province. Serbia and Montenegro are the two republics that remain in Yugoslavia. The Kosovo Liberation Army, the most militant force for ethnic Albanian independence, has stepped up attacks on the Serbian police.

In Pristina, Kosovo's capital, ethnic Albanian professors took

possession of university offices Monday despite scuffles outside involving Serbian students angered by the move.

The statement about the sanctions was made after Britain led a meeting of the Contact Group on Saturday in Birmingham while leaders of the Group of Eight industrialized nations were meeting. The Contact Group said it welcomed the decision by Milosevic and the Kosovo Albanian leader, Ibrahim Rugova, on Friday to begin talks on a settlement.

The Kosovo crisis flared in February, when the Serbian police killed dozens of civilians in attacks on Kosovo Liberation Army strongholds.

In Pristina student groups

stoned one another until the police dispersed them. No casualties were reported, although at one point gunfire crackled over the area. The dispute arose over an internationally mediated accord to integrate Pristina University, which had been exclusively Serb since 1991.

Just before midnight on Saturday the police evicted Serbian students who had occupied the main building for more than a week.

Yugoslav Prime Minister Voted Out

BELGRADE—Yugoslav Prime Minister Radoje Kontic and his government were toppled by a vote of no confidence that threatened a constitutional crisis between Serbia and Montenegro, Yugoslavia's two republics.

Deputy Prime Minister Vojin Djukanovic said Montenegro regarded Kontic's removal by allies of Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic as illegal. He said Montenegro would not "recognize the decisions of parliament or the new government until things are done according to the constitution and the law." Montenegro has a population of only 650,000 compared with Serbia's 10.5 million but is an equal partner in the Yugoslav federation.

Washington Post
May 19, 1998
Pg. 16

Washington Times

May 19, 1998

Pg. 3

4 panelists on military oppose staff picks, walk out

By Rowan Scarborough
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

Four members of a congressionally mandated commission on sex-integrated military training abruptly walked out of a closed-door meeting yesterday after failing to stop staff appointments by the panel's conservative chairman.

All four are believed to back the Army, Air Force and Navy practice of mixing male and female recruits. The chairman, Anita Blair, executive director of the Independent Women's Forum, is believed to oppose the policy.

The exit at the panel's second organizational meeting underscores the deep ideological split within a group appointed by Republicans and Democrats earlier this year.

The four protesting members announced their intentions to resign. A congressional source said the matter could be settled today when the 10-member Commission on Military Training and Gender Related Issues is scheduled to meet with members of Congress. The source said the action could be a gambit to win staff appointments more to their liking.

The four left after losing two votes in an effort to stop the staff appointments of Mrs. Blair, congressional sources said. Mrs. Blair didn't return a reporter's phone calls.

The law establishing the panel gives the chairman complete authority to appoint an executive director and three more staffers.

Congressional sources said the four who walked were Barbara Pope, a consultant who served under President Bush as an assistant Navy secretary; Mady Wechster Segal, a sociology professor at the University of Maryland; Frederick Pang, a former Democratic Senate staffer and Pentagon official in the Clinton administration; and Nancy Cantor, provost and executive vice president for academic affairs at the University of Michigan.

Democrats pushed for the appointment of Mrs. Segal, Mr. Pang and Ms. Cantor. Mrs. Pope was a compromise choice of House Republicans and Democrats.

Some conservative Republicans who favor separating the sexes during training would just as soon see the Blair panel fade away. This is because another panel appointed by Defense Secretary William S. Cohen and headed by for-

mer Sen. Nancy Kassebaum Baker, Kansas Republican, already has given conservatives what they want. Mrs. Baker's panel recommended the Army, Air Force and Navy revert to sex segregation at the small-unit level.

Conservatives have inserted language in the pending defense authorization bill to enact the Baker commission findings. One way opponents aim to defeat the measure is by saying Congress should delay any action until Mrs. Blair's group finishes its task.

"I think we ought to look seriously now at just disbanding the commission and accepting the recommendations of the Kassebaum commission," said Rep. Roscoe G. Bartlett, Maryland Republican.

"I'm not sure we would have ever appointed the commission if we had known the secretary of defense was going to appoint his commission," he said. "I suspect much of what our commission was to have done was already done by the Kassebaum commission."

The commission's rocky start comes after congressional delay in naming 10 members. It was supposed to file a final report this year, but now it won't be done until 1999.

Women Build Rank As Marines

Today, Female Recruits Face The Same Standards Men Do - But 20 Years Ago It Was A Different Story.

Ann Scott Tyson
Special to the
Christian Science Monitor

PARRIS ISLAND, S.C. - When Sgt. Maj. Beverly Morgan enlisted in the Marine Corps in 1975, the physical demands on women were rigorous: hours of backbreaking exercise with a red-hot metal

implement.

"We did a lot of ironing," recalls Major Morgan, "and taking care of our uniforms, and shining shoes...."

"Our shirts would stand up," agrees another veteran. "No one could iron better than a woman marine."

Next, there was the strategically tricky task of applying

eye shadow.

"We were issued makeup and taught to blend it with our skin tone," says Morgan. "We had to wear lipstick every day. When we got up, it was the thing to do."

Today, relaxing in her Parris Island, S.C., office in combat fatigues and black leather boots, Morgan can

laugh about the days in the 1970s and '80s when she had to wear high heels and skirts and couldn't fire a gun.

Opportunities for women in the Marine Corps, reputedly the US military's most macho force, have widened significantly this decade. The percentage of women in the elite, 174,000-strong service has grown by roughly one-third to 5.4 percent. Meanwhile, women have doubled their presence in senior enlisted grades.

These trends will continue as the Corps recruits more

Christian Science
Monitor
May 19, 1998
Pg. 1

women and fewer men, says Lt. Col. Angela Salinas, who commands recruit training for all female marines. She says the Corps has lifted its ceiling on the recruitment of women and dropped an automatic preference for men.

"Before, [recruiters] would pick the male regardless" of whether a female candidate was more qualified, Colonel Salinas says. "Now they select whoever is better."

Moreover, women's training and physical fitness standards, once comparatively low, are now identical in many respects to those for men. Just as men do, women must now qualify in marksmanship and complete the gruelling, 54-hour "Crucible" exercise at the end of camp. Still, compared with their counterparts in the Army, Air Force, and Navy, women marines have achieved this hard-fought progress at the rate of a slow belly crawl.

"The Marine Corps was always the most resistant of all the military services to integrating women, and continues to be," says a former female marine officer and 20-year Corps veteran, requesting anonymity.

Combat missions

By major measures of integration - the percentages of enlisted women (5.4 percent), female officers (4.4 percent), and positions open to women (62 percent) - the marines rank far below other branches. The marines remain the only US military service to run an all-female boot camp, a policy that critics say holds women back.

"Until you start integrating women at the bottom they will always be a step behind. Male marines know that from the private on up," says the former officer.

The Marine Corps counters that its main mission, combat, prevents it from opening more to women. It also vigorously defends its gender segregation policy, as do its backers in Congress.

"Our system works for us," says Marine Corps Sgt. Maj. Lewis Lee. "Anything that distracts, we want to eliminate."

Last year a panel led by former Sen. Nancy Kassebaum recommended resegregating all basic training along the marine model. The services resisted,

and in March Defense Secretary William Cohen stopped short of adopting the change.

But the issue is still hotly debated.

This month, a House committee passed a bill that would require all services to train female recruits separately in an bid to reduce sexual misconduct in the military.

Harassment an issue

Ironically, however, the two most recent Pentagon surveys on sexual harassment show that more women marines - 64 percent in 1995 and 75 percent in 1988 - reported unwanted sexual attention than did women in any other service.

Colonel Salinas asserts that since 1995 a new Marine Corps emphasis on "core values" has

improved the understanding of "acceptable behavior." The survey, she says, mainly reflects "inappropriate language" and overtures rather than "graver" problems such as sexual assault, battery, or rape.

Yet today, female officers and enlisted marines say harassment continues, as does fear of retribution for reporting it. "It happens with high-ranking officers, too," says one woman stationed at Parris Island. "They all have their faults, they're human."

Worry also lingers among women marines that they will be falsely labeled as lesbians as the legacy of a series of "witch hunts" at Parris Island in the 1980s that named scores of women homosexuals.

Despite improvements

since the 1994 "don't ask, don't tell" policy took effect, military women are now receiving homosexual conduct discharges in greater numbers and at a higher rate than are men. In the Marines, isolated cases continue of the overzealous pursuit of women rumored to be gay.

Such ongoing gender issues add challenge to the already tough task of recruiting highly qualified women to become marines and especially to fill the prestigious yet demanding job of drill instructor.

"People think all female drill instructors are gay," says Morgan, who conducts briefings to recruit women for the position. "I have to reassure them that's not true."

Christian Science Monitor May 19, 1998

Pg. 4

Military Manners

Lady Marines Never Hung Around The Punch Bowl

Ann Scott Tyson
Special to the
Christian Science Monitor

PARRIS ISLAND, S.C. - For decades, every woman joining the Marines learned to describe her mission in a single, five-word mantra: "Free a man to fight."

Women were recruited during World Wars I and II strictly to alleviate manpower shortages. Known as "skirt marines" and "marinettes," they worked in motor transport, supplies, and secretarial jobs. Training consisted mainly of

typing and clerical skills.

Marriage for female marines was frowned upon, and until 1975, pregnancy could - and often did - lead to automatic discharge.

Still, women marines were expected to retain their "femininity." Starting in 1967 all recruits took a 12- to 31-hour "Image Development Course" from instructors trained at Pan Am's International Stewardess College. "Boot camp was a finishing school," recalls one veteran marine.

Recruits were issued lip-

stick and eye shadow (blue or green), sold wigs, and required to wear curlers in their hair at night. They learned how to get in and out of cars gracefully, blow smoke over their shoulders, and sip - rather than guzzle - their beverages.

One final exam involved hosting a formal tea. "We got demerits if we hung around the punch bowl instead of mingling," says the veteran, requesting anonymity.

As recently as the 1980s, women were barred from firing weapons or even wearing pants without permission.

Christian Science Monitor May 19, 1998

Pg. 4

Female Drill Instructors: Heroines Of The Marine Corps

Ann Scott Tyson
Special to the
Christian Science Monitor

PARRIS ISLAND, S.C. - Since his mother became a Marine drill instructor, 11-year-old Marcus Simms has learned to appreciate life's smaller pleasures.

"He's so glad when I'm still in bed when he wakes up in the morning," says Staff Sgt. Kimberly Simms, who is serving a two-year stint at Parris Island, S.C., in what is argua-

bly the Marine Corps's toughest job.

Attention all parents who think you have a hard life juggling work and family: Take heart from the case of Sergeant Simms.

A single mother, Simms works from 80 to 100 hours a week. She spends hour after hour, day and night, trying to drill military discipline into dozens of often troubled teenage girls - not to mention leading them on midnight marches in full battle gear.

Simms has zero social life, and barely any time to spend with her son.

"He's a latchkey kid. After school he spends a couple of hours at home alone, then goes to a friend's house," says Simms, who used to work 9 to 5.

To become a drill instructor, Simms had to undergo a widely feared, 11-week training school so physically arduous that many women are injured and 26 percent drop out - nearly triple the attrition rate of men.

Indeed, women such as Simms who volunteer as drill instructors are in many ways

the heroines of the Marine Corps. Yet full recognition for their sacrifice has come slowly.

Only 19 months ago were they first allowed to wear the famous trademark of the male drill instructor: the Smokey Bear hat.

Philadelphia Inquirer

May 19, 1998

Pg. 4

U.N. Secretary-General Kofi Annan recommended yesterday a six-month renewal, until Nov. 30, of the U.N. Disengagement Observer Force separating the Syrian and Israeli armies on the Golan Heights. The 1,048-member force was established in 1974 to monitor a cease-fire and troop disengagement agreement that followed the 1973 Arab-Israeli war.

Naval Academy Plebes Stick To It, Conquer Obelisk

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. B1

By Amy Argetsinger
Washington Post
Staff Writer

Two hundred pounds of lard. A granite obelisk. And more than 1,000 sweaty, half-naked bodies, piled as many as four high.

The raucous ritual that marks the end of the school year for U.S. Naval Academy freshmen is Annapolis's version of "American Gladiators" -- a jaw-dropping tableau of pain and mirth.

Every year, the plebe class at the elite officer-training college celebrates the start of graduation and commissioning week in a bizarre, Herculean effort to retrieve a sailor's cap from the tip of the 21-foot-high Herndon Monument -- which older students have greased up to make the job harder.

Yesterday, it took the Class of 2001 two hours and 22 minutes to form a groaning, writhing human pyramid to heave one of their peers to the top -- in 90-degree heat.

"I think it's a riot!" said flabbergasted spectator Lorraine Holden, a plebe mother from King of Prussia, Pa. "I just hope nobody gets hurt."

Seconds later, medics walked past carrying a young man on a backboard.

Of murky origins and uncer-

tain meaning, Herndon Climb has weathered changing times and attitudes: the academy's move to coeducation, crack-downs on hazing and efforts to promote a more dignified officer-and-gentleman image.

It thrives, miraculously, in the land of lawsuits and the era of safety-first.

"It is a tradition that has been around for a long time and that is likely to be here a long time," said Cmdr. Mike Brady, academy spokesman. "I couldn't imagine commissioning week without it."

When school officials announced plans to revamp plebe year, they originally said freshmen would shed their lowly plebe status in April -- about a month earlier than usual -- after completing a day-long course designed to test strength and teamwork.

But a wave of Herndon sentiment nixed that element of the plan; the plebes stayed plebes until they tackled the granite yesterday.

The roar of a cannon gets them started. Plebes rush the monument, stripping down to bathing suits and flinging shirts and shoes at the granite in a desperate attempt to knock some lard off.

The shoes stick. That's how thick the lard is.

The strategy is something like this: Big guys -- football

player-types -- form the base of the pyramid, linking arms around the monument. Others push in to support them as a second tier of medium-weight men and women scramble onto their shoulders and heads.

The third tier gets tricky. Over and over, a midshipman gets a foothold on another's shoulders, then agonizingly slowly slips and falls.

Another holds his ground, but the crowd gasps as his swimming trunks start to slip off his hips. He pulls them back up just in time.

Cody Howard, 19, of Denver, emerges from the mob with lard between his brows, grass flecking his body and fingernail scratches on his arms. "I was getting crushed in there. It was pretty bad."

Darija Gvozdenovic, a 22-year-old exchange student from Croatia, achieves a height unknown to most female students -- the third tier of bodies, perched on a fellow midshipman's shoulders before toppling forward. "It's so slippery!" she said. "You can't stand without falling."

Herndon's origins have never been documented but may have been rooted in plebe activities from the early part of the century. To celebrate the end of their boot-camp-style first year at the academy, plebes would snake-dance and

sing through the campus after graduation, Naval Academy museum curator James W. Cheevers said. At some point, they started scaling the academy's monuments, topping them with sailor's caps.

Eventually, their attention focused on Herndon, the obelisk erected in 1860 to honor Cmdr. William Lewis Herndon, who went down with the SS Central America in 1857. Sometime in the 1960s, sophomores started spreading lard on the monument.

For more than two hours, the pyramid rises and falls, rises and falls, seemingly getting nowhere. Then suddenly, Joshua Stewart, a 6-foot-5 plebe from Downingtown, Pa., scales three shaky tiers of flesh, flicks a long arm into the air and knocks the cap off the top.

Someone hands him an officer's white cap, and he quickly places it on top before falling triumphantly backward into the crowd.

According to academy legend, the midshipman who makes it to the top will be the first from his class to make the rank of admiral. According to academy officials, that has never actually happened.

"It's all about perseverance," said Stewart, 19. "I thought it was going to take forever and a day to do this. You just got to stick to it."

Defense Daily

F-22 Fighter Resumes Flight Testing At Edwards AFB

May 19, 1998 Pg. 1

The Air Force's first F-22 fighter jet--Raptor 01--resumed its flight test program on Sunday with a successful flight test at Edwards AFB, Calif.

During the one-hour and 20-minute subsonic flight, the F-22's flight dynamics, speed-brake handling and formation flying characteristics were successfully tested and evaluated against a complex computer model, Edwards spokesman John Haire told *Defense Daily*.

"Everything performed well and the aircraft is in good shape" for further testing, he added.

The F-22 is being built by a team led by Lockheed Martin [LMT] and is powered by Pratt & Whitney [UTX] supercruise engines. The Air Force plans to buy 339 F-22s during the next decade. The first squadron of F-22s is scheduled to become operational around 2005.

The F-22's developmental flight test program is expected to continue for about five more years. At that time, the aircraft will transition to an operational test and evaluation program to determine how the F-22 can best be used to defeat potential threats.

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

May 18, 1998

Cohen, At Norfolk State Graduation, Stresses Need To End Racial Barriers In Military

By Dave Mayfield,
The Virginian-Pilot

NORFOLK -- Defense Secretary William S. Cohen told ROTC graduates at Norfolk State University on Saturday that America's military hasn't yet achieved a "triumph of full inclusion over exclusion" for African Americans.

But he said racial barriers will continue to fall in the armed forces, calling it "a moral imperative and a military necessity." In today's shrinking military, he noted, "we cannot afford to waste the talents of a single individual."

Cohen delivered the keynote address at the commissioning ceremony for 31 Army, Marine Corps and Navy graduates of Norfolk State's ROTC program. The defense secretary used Armed Forces Day to kick off commemoration of the 50th anniversary this year of President Harry S. Truman's executive order ushering out racial discrimination in the military.

In an address filled with tributes to black heroes of the military's segregated past, Cohen regretfully recalled a society that welcomed them "as brothers-in-arms when democracy wanted them" but "kept them at arms length whenever they wanted democracy."

He announced that he will seek the award of a fourth star to retired Air Force Lt. Gen. Benjamin O. Davis Jr., who as a colonel in the then-Army Air Corps commanded the World War II unit of black fighter pilots known as the Tuskegee Airmen. The men of the legendary 332nd Fighter Group flew more than 200 missions in Europe as escorts for bombers and didn't lose a single plane they were assigned to defend. They were the country's first black fighter pilots.

"There is no rank higher for a general, and few deserve this honor more or have waited longer for it," Cohen said of Davis, who was unable to attend Saturday's ceremony.

The defense secretary painted a rosier present and

future for today's black military achievers.

African Americans are still poorly represented in the officer corps and tend to be concentrated in peripheral roles in support, service and supply, he noted. But for the first time, the Army, Navy and Air Force each has a black four-star officer at the same time, Cohen said, gesturing to the crowd in the L. Douglas Wilder Performing Arts Center.

From the audience then rose Adm. J. Paul Reason, commander-in-chief of the Atlantic Fleet; Gen. Lloyd W. "Fig" Newton, commander of the Air Force's Education and Training Command; and Gen. Johnnie E. Wilson, commander of the Army Materiel Command. The several hundred attendees at the ceremony applauded the trio heartily.

The show of stars made an impression on retired Army Lt. Col. Charles Bussey. He was among several current and past African-American military officers sharing the stage with Cohen and was recognized by the defense secretary for having broken color barriers.

As a member of the Tuskegee Airmen, Bussey flew 115 bomber-escort missions, scoring kills of German fighters. He then rejoined the Army for the Korean War, and as commander of an all-black engineering company, found himself in ground combat. In July 1950 he and three other men used their two machine guns to keep more than 250 enemy troops from outflanking their company.

"In my time, we didn't have any black four-stars . . . and black one-stars were few and far between," Bussey, 77, said during a reception after Saturday's ceremony.

He recalls his initial reaction to Truman's executive order of July 26, 1948. "I just didn't think anything was going to happen," he said, "because he wasn't strong enough to take on all those white generals."

Despite Truman's determination, the Army remained

deeply segregated for a decade afterward, recalled Bussey, who served in units in which all enlisted men were black as late as 1957, for instance.

Now, opportunities for people of all colors are growing at every level, he said, "and I think we have a better military all around as a result of it."

Dachelle Banks of Norfolk, who was commissioned Saturday as an Army field artillery officer, is one of those who, as Cohen put it, will "inherit the legacy" of heroes such as Bussey.

By her mother's account,

Jacksonville (FL) Times-Union

May 15, 1998 Pg. B1

Submarine Shock Tests Delayed

By John Fritz
Times-Union staff writer

The Navy's plan to detonate powerful underwater explosions to test the battle mettle of the Seawolf submarine has been put off until 2000, officials said.

The \$50 million testing program, which the Navy wants to do off Jacksonville, initially was scheduled for last summer. But flaws in the submarine that had to be fixed pushed back its delivery date and the test schedule.

Officials previously said the tests would be rescheduled for this summer. But the money could not be reprogrammed until 2000, said Capt. Paul Sullivan, the Seawolf program manager.

"You get money in a given fiscal year to go do a trial. If your trial gets delayed past the end of that fiscal year, then you are into a major financial drill to try to finance it the following year," Sullivan said. "We couldn't work it out."

The delay means the first two submarines will be finished and construction on the final one will be well under way by the time the so-called "shock testing" is conducted.

The first ship was delivered

she is determined to make the most of every opening in her future.

"Hard-working -- that girl is hard-working," Lelia Banks said as the ceremony opened. Besides going to school and serving in the ROTC battalion, she bragged, her daughter also worked full-time as a manager for a fast-food restaurant. "She can do anything she sets her mind to."

After pinning second lieutenant's bars to the shoulders of her daughter's dress uniform, mother watched daughter lead her fellow commissionees to the stage after Cohen's address.

The words of the defense secretary were still fresh as he then administered the oath of duty to the new officers. "You," he had told them, "will create your own legends."

in July 1997 and the second one is scheduled for delivery to the Navy in December. The last ship, recently named the USS Jimmy Carter, is to be turned over to the Navy in December 2001.

Sullivan said that if the shock testing reveals any deficiencies, the subs would be backfit to correct them.

The delivery of the first ship was delayed, Sullivan said, because fixes had to be made on a sonar fairing, metal access plates and rubber hull coating that came off during tests at speed.

"I can't tell you how fast it goes, but it goes a little bit faster than we expected," he said. "In these cases, we had things designed right on the margin and, particularly when you do turns and maneuvers at high speed, some of this stuff started to come off the side."

"Those are growing pains you expect on the first ship of a class," Sullivan said.

The Navy's newest, fastest and quietest attack submarine, the Seawolf will be subjected to five underwater explosions during the shock testing. Each time, the submerged ship will move closer to the center of the 10,000-pound blast, about 100 miles off the coast.

"The Navy wants to know -- Congress wants to know -- if there are any inherent vulnerabilities in this platform before

it goes into combat,' said Steve Schulze, the shock test project manager. 'That's why we do this testing, so we're sure the guys are going to be safe.'

A draft environmental impact study identified the Jacksonville area as the best place to conduct the tests.

The study also considered the Norfolk, Va., area but concluded that the number of marine mammals potentially affected would be eight times lower in the Jacksonville area.

While unlikely that any endangered marine mammals -- such as the Northern right whale -- would be harmed, the blast could be expected to kill up to six sea turtles and one sea

mammal, the study concluded.

It is also anticipated that the blasts would kill fish, and the plume of water created by the explosion might even knock birds out of the sky, the study said.

A final version of the report, which has been updated with some new information on marine mammal hearing, is expected to be released by the end of this month.

Officials said the overall findings are expected to be consistent with those in the draft. A decision on where the testing will be conducted cannot be made for at least 45 days after the report is published.

Norfolk Virginian-Pilot

Navy Chaplain Claims That Religious Discrimination Stopped His Rise To Commander's Rank

By Dale Eisman
The Virginian-Pilot

WASHINGTON -- To a succession of his bosses, among them six flag officers, Lt. Cmdr. Stan M. Aufderheide looked like a sure bet for a long and distinguished career as a Navy leader.

Through 15 years of service fitness reports, the Lutheran chaplain had only one grade lower than an "A." Ashore and at sea, superiors had pegged him as a future candidate for flag rank; his current boss, Adm. T. Joseph Lopez, considers Aufderheide "one of the finest chaplains" and best officers Lopez has encountered in more than 30 years in uniform.

Today, Aufderheide is fighting just to stay in the Navy. Having been passed over twice for promotion to commander, he is required to retire.

In letters to lawmakers and a formal complaint to the Navy, Aufderheide claims that Rear Adm. A. Byron Holderby, a Norfolk native nominated last month for a second star and permanent appointment as the Navy's senior minister, effectively blocked his advance last year because he and Holderby belong to different Lutheran factions.

Aufderheide's involuntary retirement has been delayed so that the Navy can weigh his request for appointment of a

special board to review his record again.

But in the meantime, his troubling allegations about religious discrimination in the chaplain corps have sidetracked Holderby's nomination as the Navy's new chief of chaplains and rekindled discussion on Capitol Hill about the fairness of the way the military branches evaluate officers for promotion.

Aufderheide's admirers argue that his record is so clearly superior to those of several officers promoted above him that the injustice of his situation is indisputable.

"It just doesn't compute," said one congressional aide who has reviewed confidential files on the case. Everyone understands that as the military continues to downsize, some talented officers are being forced into retirement, he said, "but this guy's record is virtually flawless."

Defenders of the decision to leave Aufderheide behind suggest that the Navy must consider more than the medals an officer has won or grades on fitness reports in deciding whether the officer is the "best" candidate for advancement.

"Simple quantitative measurements are not enough to determine who should be promoted and who should not," argues a Navy inspector gen-

Time

May 25, 1998

Gun Running

Did the U.S. Put Its Foot Down, Then Turn Away?

While the U.S. last week loudly protested a wave of atrocities sweeping the war-torn African nation of Sierra Leone, questions arose about whether enough had been done to support the United Nations arms embargo that was imposed last October and that the U.S. backed. Did the State Department ignore a clandestine delivery by a group of British mercenaries of nearly 40 tons

of high-powered weapons to the diamond-rich nation?

Both British Foreign Secretary ROBIN COOK and State Dept. spokesman JAMES RUBIN deny knowledge of the shipment. But a well-informed U.S. official tells TIME that word of the February deal was flashed to Washington from Africa and elsewhere. A participant in a Foggy Bottom meeting in early March says the completed shipment was described in detail at that session. But U.S. officials raised no alarm that the U.N. embargo had been violated. --By Adam Zagorin/Washington

May 18, 1998

Capt. Joseph N. Stafford, the equal opportunity reviewer.

But the inspector general, Vice Adm. Lee F. Gunn, called in at Stafford's suggestion for a more detailed investigation, concluded that Aufderheide was judged fairly.

Indeed, the inspector general said, the '97 promotion board was specifically cautioned -- by Holderby -- to put aside denominational considerations as they reviewed the candidates for advancement. And the '98 board was headed by Rear Adm. Donald K. Muchow, then chief of chaplains and, like Aufderheide, a member of the Lutheran Church-Missouri Synod.

Holderby belongs to a larger Lutheran group, the Evangelical Lutheran Church of America. The 1997 commanders board for chaplains, which he headed, promoted all four of the Evangelical Lutheran candidates in its pool: Aufderheide and the other Missouri Synod candidate were among those turned away.

Stafford found that contrast troubling, adding that Aufderheide's record was "stronger than most of those selected" for promotion in other denominations. "It appears that the board may have systematically applied a denominational quota system," he wrote.

Though the Navy actively seeks chaplains from all major denominations, ministers of each faith are required to serve sailors of all faiths. Neither denominations nor divisions within denominations are sup-

eral's report on the Aufderheide case. "If that were so, there would be no reason to have a (promotion) board, a computer could do the job."

Neither Holderby, 63, a College of William and Mary graduate who twice has been cited for the Legion of Merit award, nor Aufderheide, a chaplain on Lopez's staff as commander of Navy forces in Europe, could be reached for comment on the case this week.

Ohio Sen. John Glenn, a senior member of the Senate Armed Services Committee, has put a hold on the panel's consideration of Holderby's nomination pending a review of the case by Defense Department investigators.

Florida's two senators, meanwhile, have written top Pentagon officials to suggest that "the Navy's selection process may not be serving the larger interests of the Navy."

In the Navy's top offices, two separate investigations of Aufderheide's discrimination claim have produced opposite conclusions. An equal opportunity officer who reviewed Aufderheide's record and those of other officers promoted over him by two boards decided his allegation "has merit."

"Neither the 1997 or '98 (promotion) boards conducted an impartial evaluation of (Aufderheide's) record," wrote

posed to be considered by promotion boards.

Because of confidentiality rules governing promotion boards, Stafford wasn't allowed to interview board members. The inspector general, who had no such restriction, found only one member who sensed any denominational discrimination and that apparently was in a case other than Aufderheide's.

Board members, the inspector general's report said, used terms like "low key" to describe Holderby's leadership of their deliberations. He took pains, they said, to encourage everyone to voice their opinions and to not be unduly influenced by his status as the only flag officer on the board.

The inspector general also noted that Stafford did not interview anyone in the chaplain corps about qualities that make an exceptional chaplain. For each part of the Navy, the report suggested, there is a slightly different standard for determining which officers are "best and fully qualified" for advancement.

"The human membership of a board brings a certain element of subjectivity to the deliberative process," the report concluded. And that element, it added, can't be duplicated just by reviewing each officer's written record.

The inspector general's report, which has not been publicly released but was reviewed Thursday by The Virginian-Pilot, provides a rare look at the internal workings of the promotion process. Officers serving on promotion boards are sworn to secrecy, and the Navy guards their deliberations much as a priest protects the sanctity of his confessional.

The Navy runs more than 200 of the boards each year, convening groups of officers in each of its communities to review the records of candidates of lower rank. Captains and commanders in the submarine service, for example, routinely are convened to judge submarine lieutenants eligible for promotion to lieutenant commander.

To promote diversity, the Navy requires that minority and female officers be on every board where minorities and women are in the pool of junior officers being considered. It

generally also places at least one officer from a different community on each board as a sort of counterweight to the board majority.

The boards, ranging in size from a handful to dozens of officers -- depending on the size of the promotion pool -- are convened at the Bureau of Naval Personnel in Washington. They get written instructions from the secretary of the Navy, including a cap on the number of officers that they can recommend for advancement and a pointed warning to put aside any personal animosities they may have toward particular candidates.

"If personal remarks, based on a member's personal knowledge, could be considered adverse (to a candidate), the member cannot discuss his personal knowledge or evaluation unless such matter is contained in the officer's official record or other material (legally) placed before the board," says the Navy's written instructions to board members.

The boards meet in a windowless, soundproofed room, their sessions monitored by "recorders" who, like the board members, are sworn to secrecy about the deliberations and required by their oaths to report anything irregular.

Several officers who have served on boards said that at the outset of their meetings the records of promotion candidates are distributed and each board member is designated as the briefer for one or more candidates. The records include fitness reports and award citations, often along with supporting letters from senior officers; candidates may not appear in person or make written appeals.

The briefers present an oral summary of each candidate's record and the board then votes, in secret, on each. A score of 4 means the member has 100 percent confidence that the candidate should be promoted, a 0 means there is no confidence.

In most cases, said one veteran of several boards, the initial winnowing out is simple. Any candidates who are top rated by every board member are set aside and considered as recommended. Those at the bottom are eliminated.

The crunch comes as the

board takes a second, third or even a fourth look at those in the middle, agonizing over the last few slots to be filled.

His service on promotion boards has been among the most wrenching experiences of his Navy career, said Rear Adm. Thomas Jurkowsky, the Navy's top spokesman. "You see some outstanding records and some outstanding people and you have to pass them over."

"I have been in promotion boards where it was so tumultuous for us emotionally. . . . I

have gone back to my hotel room and cried."

Jurkowsky calls the system "time-honored" and notes that both the Navy and Congress monitor it closely to protect against just the kind of problems cited in Aufderheide's complaint.

"It's a process that's sacrosanct," said another senior Navy official.

Then, correcting himself, he added: "Well no, what's sacrosanct is our responsibility and our commitment to try and be as fair as we can."

Washington Post May 17, 1998 Pg. 19

Jailed Spy Says He Erred Trying To Serve Two Nations

Associated Press

BUTNER, N.C.—The former U.S. naval intelligence clerk who spied for Israel said Friday he did not work against the United States but made a mistake in trying to serve two countries he loved.

"There is nothing good that came as a result of my actions," Jonathan Pollard said during a prison interview. "I tried to serve two countries at the same time. That does not work."

Pollard spoke to reporters after meeting with Israeli Cabinet Secretary Danny Naveh, who visited the prison to inform Pollard of Israel's acknowledgment Monday that Pollard had worked as an Israeli agent, a move seen by Pollard's supporters as critical before the United States would consider releasing him.

"I can just express my hope that the case will be reconsidered," Naveh said. "The guy expressed his regret. He has spent more than 12 years in prison. It's time for a humane

gesture here.

Pollard was sentenced in 1987 to life without parole for passing classified military documents to Israel. Until Monday, Israel had maintained that Pollard acted alone and not at its direction.

Pollard said his case attracted attention from Israeli citizens because they all have to serve the government as soldiers and expect the government to protect them.

"People could identify with my predicament . . . because they knew they could be in my place through love of the state," Pollard said as a Defense Department agent sat nearby, ready to stop the interview if the topic veered into security matters.

Pollard expressed remorse several times, an expression that Israeli officials visiting him said was important for the U.S. government to hear before it might consider a release.

If released, Pollard said, he wants to live in Israel where he has a water and energy firm.

He said he had learned his lesson. "There can be no justification for violating the trust given an intelligence officer. I made a mistake," he said.

London Times

May 19, 1998

Nato Fears 'Spy' Radar In Cyprus

Nicosia: Britain and America, alarmed that Moscow will have access to intelligence from the skies over Nato's highly sensitive southeastern flank, are increasing pressure on the Greek Cypriots not to deploy Russian-made anti-

aircraft missiles, defence analysts said yesterday (Michael Theodoulou writes).

Both countries said they were more concerned by the powerful radar that accompanies the air defence system than the missiles. It could enable Russia to monitor every flight in and out of Britain's sprawling airbase at Akrotiri, the biggest RAF base in the world.

Keeping Nuclear Arms In Check

India's nuclear weapons tests threaten to undo 35 years worth of work by the United States and other countries to limit the spread of nuclear arms. Instead of abandoning those efforts and improvising new approaches, a course recommended by some arms control experts, Washington and its allies should redouble their commitment to make the international control system work effectively.

As difficult as it may be, India and Pakistan must be persuaded to sign and abide by the 1996 test ban treaty that has now been signed by 149 nations. By joining the treaty, India and Pakistan would bind themselves to refrain from any future testing. Their inclusion would also make it easier to detect violations by permitting the installation of monitoring equipment at their nuclear test sites.

Enlisting India and Pakistan would be easier if the Senate ratified the test ban treaty, now irresponsibly held up by Senator Jesse Helms. Once again, the capricious chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is holding the nation's interest hostage to his ideological whims. Ratification would allow Washington to participate in a review conference next year that will develop diplo-

matic strategies for bringing holdout nations into the treaty. Without American leadership, the treaty itself and the conference will be empty exercises.

The performance of American intelligence agencies should also be improved so that future test preparations by any country can be spotted in advance, giving diplomats the chance to intervene. The White House was given no warning about the Indian underground explosions. Some of the \$400 million a year the Energy Department now spends on nuclear weapons detection research ought to be used to develop sensitive seismic measuring devices that can monitor low-yield tests from afar.

Non-nuclear countries are more easily dissuaded from developing atomic weapons when nuclear states restrain their own arsenals. Progress in this area has been slowed in recent years. Russia's parliament should long ago have ratified the nuclear missile cuts negotiated more than five years ago by George Bush and Boris Yeltsin.

If Bill Clinton does not want nuclear anarchy to be his foreign policy legacy, he must galvanize the Senate to act on the test ban treaty and use American influence to strengthen the world's arms control mechanisms. Without them, this planet would be a far more dangerous place.

FRANK GAFFNEY JR.

Washington Times

May 19, 1998

Pg. 21

The real failures of intelligence

Ah, 'tis the season for post-mortems on "the failure of intelligence" following India's recent "surprise" underground nuclear tests. The real failure that became manifest last week, however, is not the result of a deficiency of exotic U.S. espionage capabilities or analysis but a serious, and ongoing, shortfall in the more prosaic kind of intelligence — as in IQ.

Take, for example, the following three cases in point:

- First, the Indian tests demonstrated the flawed assumptions and utter futility of the centerpiece of the Clinton administration's pre-eminent foreign policy — the notion that arms control and other international arrangements can restrain proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD).

Historical experience, to say nothing of common sense, tells us the behavior of most countries (the United States being a notable exception) is guided by their perceived national security interests, not arms control treaties — even those they have signed. Before India's series of tests began, Defense Minister George Fernandes telegraphed what was worrying his country: China's efforts to "encircle" India via Pakistan, Burma and Tibet.

This reality — together with domestic political considerations — was sufficient to prompt the Indians to proceed, despite the prospect of serious American economic

sanctions. The fact that the Clinton administration has chosen, pursuant to the Comprehensive Test Ban (CTB) Treaty, permanently to deny the United States the right to conduct nuclear tests appears to have been utterly irrelevant to India's determination to perform some of its own. The Clinton administration is insulting the intelligence of the American people by hyping this accord as means of actually countering WMD proliferation.

- Second, even an average IQ could have figured out that India would be alarmed by U.S. actions aiding China's military buildup (including providing the PRC with advanced supercomputers, machine tools and missile-relevant technology) and acceding to, if not abetting, Chinese strategic ambitions throughout Asia. Indeed, President Clinton's kow-towing to Beijing — epitomized by his willingness during his planned trip to China to join his hosts in defiling the hallowed ground of Tiananmen Square — could have been predicted to have one (or both) of the following, undesirable results: (a) pushing India to declare its nuclear capability or (b) driving it back into the arms of its erstwhile patrons in the Kremlin.

- Third, as Sen. Daniel Patrick Moynihan pointed out on Sunday, the Clinton administration — in keeping with its reflexive tendency to "share" sensitive U.S. intelligence information with foreign governments — showed the Indians in

1995 just how good our spy satellites were in monitoring their test site. Lo and behold, in 1998 Delhi went to great and highly successful lengths to deny the U.S. such information.

What is at work here is stupidity, not a failure of U.S. intelligence. The administration's injudicious practice of noblesse oblige with highly perishable espionage sources-and-methods does not prevent objectionable behavior by others. Rather, it simply compromises those capabilities, assuring that the American government knows everless about ominous developments around the world.

Unfortunately, it appears that the opportunity presented by the Indian test to learn from past mistakes has been lost on much of official Washington. For instance, far from grasping the evident bankruptcy of its nuclear non-proliferation policy, the Clinton administration is conforming to the classic definition of a zealot — someone who redoubles his effort upon losing sight of his objective.

The administration refuses to acknowledge either of two pertinent facts: One, India's recent activities simply confirm that countries can maintain long-running nuclear weapons programs without conducting nuclear tests. As Michael Ledeen observed in the Wall Street Journal last Friday, "any country willing to explode five bombs must have plenty to spare." Last week's

tests were a coming-out party for India's decades-old nuclear program, not the birth of something new.

And two, the Indians demonstrated the complete unverifiability of the Comprehensive Test Ban. Press reports indicate that four out of five of the Indian detonations were undetected by the CTB's vaunted seismic monitoring system. Had they wanted to, the Indians may have been able to get away with all five.

Incredibly, far from cutting their losses on a flawed accord, President Clinton's National Security Adviser Samuel Berger, United Nations Ambassador Bill Richardson and other administration spokesmen are pressing the Senate to allow early ratification of the Comprehensive Test Ban. Senate Majority Leader Trent Lott and Foreign Relations Committee Chairman Jesse Helms have wisely said "Thanks, but no thanks" regarding action during the pre-

sent session.

Since the only practical effect of ratifying this defective CTB would be to prevent the United States permanently from conducting the sorts of periodic tests needed to maintain the effectiveness, safety and reliability of its nuclear deterrent forces, it can only be hoped that this stay of execution by the Senate will be extended indefinitely.

While they are at it, at least one of the 41 senators who voted last week to prevent debate on, and presumably approval of, the American Missile Protection Act of 1998 should reconsider the filibuster of that bill being mounted at the administration's behest. With a single switch, the 55 Republicans and four Democrats who sought action on this legislation (S.1873) — co-sponsored by Thad Cochran of Mississippi and Daniel Inouye of Hawaii — could make it, for the first time in history, the policy of the United States government "to deploy effective anti-missile

defenses of the territory of the United States as soon as technological-ly possible."

If the United States had in place effective, global missile defenses, both we and those most immediately at risk would be a lot less concerned about an arms race in South Asia (or elsewhere) involving ballistic missile-delivered weapons of mass destruction. More than any prospective arms or technology control regime, such an American capability would not only provide protection against attack; it could also serve to devalue the investments in such weapons that might otherwise be made. It doesn't take a rocket scientist to see the wisdom of relying upon defenses, rather than wishful thinking — and agreements predicated upon it.

Frank J. Gaffney Jr. is the director of the Center for Security Policy and a columnist for The Washington Times.

Wall Street Journal

May 19, 1998

Pg. 22

Still Too Many Bases

By John H. Dalton

Many Americans take for granted the U.S.'s high level of military readiness. But our defenses are imperiled unless we can find new funding for the armed forces. Closing bases we do not need would be a good starting point.

In the past 10 years, the defense budget has dropped by 40% and the size of our armed forces has been reduced by 36%. Yet even after four rounds of base closures, we have reduced the military's infrastructure by only 21%. We simply have too much over-

head.

At the same time, the military is being called on to do more than ever. Today's armed forces, particularly the Navy and Marine Corps, have been called on to respond to crises at a rate three times greater than during the Gulf War years. And the scope of their missions has also dramatically expanded, to include peacekeeping, disaster response, and humanitarian assistance, as well as traditional combat.

To maintain our current high level of readiness, we must eliminate the burden of excess military bases and infrastructure by authorizing additional base closings. Defense Secretary William Cohen has asked Congress for new rounds of base-closings in 2001 and 2005. Unfortunately, his

requests have met with resistance on Capitol Hill.

It makes no sense to waste taxpayer dollars on unnecessary infrastructure which will prevent our having adequate resources for future needs. Although this is a commonsense message, it is complicated by the difficult politics of base closures. But the process overseen by the base closings commission is a proven success—not only for the armed forces but also for affected communities. We have a great deal of experience helping such places to find uses for closed facilities and new sources of employment for displaced workers.

In Alexandria, La., more than 1,500 new jobs have been created since the closure of the

former England Air Force Base. The town's mayor, Ned Randolph, recently said, "If I had any message to give communities that would be next on the [base closings] list, I would say there is life after base closure."

Most important, the Department of Defense is saving \$5.6 billion a year from the first four rounds of base closings. An additional two rounds promise to save us another \$3 billion per year. Those savings can go a long way to restoring the important balance between readiness, quality of life for our men and women in uniform, and modernization of the armed forces.

Mr. Dalton is secretary of the Navy.

Washington Post May 19, 1998 Pg. 16

Russia, Iran Vow to Strengthen Nuclear Bond

MOSCOW—Russia and Iran, brushing aside U.S. and Israeli criticism, said they hope to step up their cooperation in the field of nuclear technology for nonmilitary purposes.

"We have very bright perspectives opening up before us," Iranian Vice President Gholamreza Aghazadeh told a news conference after a week of talks with Russian officials that focused on building a nuclear power plant in Iran.

Russia's Atomic Energy Minister Yevgeny Adamov also made clear the two countries were considering further cooperation beyond the Bushehr plant, now being built by Russian companies at the Persian Gulf port at a cost of \$850 million.

Washington Post May 19, 1998 Pg. 20

The Chinese Connection

A KEY missing piece in the inquiry into the financing of the 1996 elections has fallen into place. Congressional investigators had long suspected a "China plan" to buy influence and access and even specific concessions, but could locate no more than circumstantial evidence for it. This evidence, however, was more than a little suggestive of something rather different from the good government, "let's all pitch and help democracy and bolster progressive programs" motif that kept being defensively asserted as an explanation of what was going on. Now federal prosecutors have squeezed Johnny Chung, a California Chinese American fund-raiser who had pleaded guilty to tax and fraud charges. He reportedly has said he received funds from Chinese intelligence

and passed on \$100,000 to the Democratic Party.

There is more. Mr. Chung's Chinese connection is a well-placed military officer, an executive of a state-owned Chinese aerospace company that profited from a loosening of American standards for licensing exports of civilian communications technology in 1996. One of the American companies that did the exporting, Loral, is run by the Democrats' largest individual contributor, Bernard Schwartz. The double-barreled question at issue is whether the Chinese company influenced American policy and whether the American contributor, in return, gained from it.

Then there is the Pentagon complaint that a boost in American satellite exports resulted in the transfer of technology that conceivably could help China aim more accurately at American targets in space.

The White House denies wrongdoing. What is notable about the reaction elsewhere in Washington, however, is that some Democrats are as stirred by the tale of the Chinese connection as some of the more partisan Republicans. As a witness, Johnny Chung has his limitations. He is known as the accused "hustler" who visited the White House 49 times in the two years leading up

to the elections and whose dubious contributions totaling \$366,000 to the Democratic National Committee subsequently had to be returned. He is bargaining in his own interest. But the version of events in which he figures obviously needs to be examined up close.

The Justice Department has started down this road by opening up a "preliminary investigation"; a decision on whether to move to a special prosecutor is yet to come. Mr. Clinton says he supports a departmental investigation of alleged Chinese influence-seeking. The investigation should obviously also go to the knowledge of various administration and party officials as to what was going on and their possible knowing complicity in it. After 49 visits and donations of hundreds of thousands of dollars, the recipients of all this attention and money may surely be presumed to know something about who their benefactor is, what he is after -- and where he gets the money for his contributions. And if they didn't know, did they at least wonder? And if they wondered, did they not make any effort to find out? There's a lot to be explained.

San Diego Union-Tribune

Close Obsolete Bases

Congress must choose personnel over facilities

Secretary of Defense William Cohen makes some telling points about tough choices in American military spending. In a report to Congress calling for two more rounds of base closings -- in 2001 and 2005 -- Cohen cites these facts:

Since the height of the Cold War, the Pentagon's overall budget is down 40 percent and the size of U.S. military forces is down 36 percent. But after four rounds of base closings, we have reduced our infrastructure by only 21 percent. Between 1989 and 2003, the number of Navy ships will have declined by 46 percent, but berthing space will have been cut by only 18 percent.

Since neither the White House nor Congress shows any sign of significantly increasing military spending in an era of balanced budgets, the Pentagon is forced to cut readiness accounts, weapons procurement and research.

Nearly 100 bases have been closed or scheduled for elimination since the Base Realignment and Closure Commission began its work in 1988. Cohen says these closures will have produced a

May 18, 1998

net savings of \$25 billion by 2003 and will save about \$3 billion annually thereafter. He says two more rounds of closings would produce additional savings of \$20 billion by 2015.

So why is Congress resisting calls to redirect funds from obsolete bases to far more vital areas? Simple. Military facilities contribute to the economies in most congressional districts, and no member of Congress is eager to explain to constituents why well-paying jobs are being eliminated.

But the Pentagon notes that its programs to promote civilian economic development in areas affected by the first round of base closings have created the equivalent of 75 percent of the number of jobs lost in bases closed for two years or more.

For the most part, the take-it-or-leave-it BRAC recommendations worked well the last time around, insulating rational decision-making from political pressure. President Clinton intervened in the process in politically important California and Texas in 1995, and this may explain some of the hesitancy of the Republican Congress. But there are more important considerations. Maintaining obsolete bases at the expense of improved training and modern weapons is the wrong choice.

New York Daily News

May 18, 1998

Pg. 17

Invest In Troops, Not Tanks

By Lars-Erik Nelson

WASHINGTON - A tough-talking Army general has given new meaning to the phrase "welfare Cadillac." It's the Army's \$4 million M1A2 Abrams tank.

Oh, it's a good tank. Some armored cavalymen love it, even though they say it breaks down if the temperature goes over 90 degrees.

The problem, says Brig. Gen. Russell Honore, is, "I've got a tank commander who has a wife and three kids living in a trailer park down in Killeen, [Tex.] and he's on the WIC [Women, Infants and Children] program."

WIC is a federal welfare program that provides food vouchers to low-income mothers and children considered to be at "nutritional risk." The U.S. military is literally starving its troops so it can feed the defense contractors who push high-tech weapons.

What happens when you put a \$4 million tank in the hands of people whom you can't afford to pay adequately or train properly?

Honore, assistant commander of the 1st Cavalry Division, gives one example: "Two privates were slave-starting [jump starting] an M1 tank, and during the slave-starting process burned up \$415,000 worth

of circuit cards in less than two minutes. That's a battalion's budget for a quarter."

Honore's horror stories about Army spending priorities were told at a conference in March in Huntsville, Ala., and were intended for internal consumption. But they were so blunt and so vivid that they rocketed through the Pentagon's e-mail.

Honore woke up Army weapons-procurement officers with his opening words: "You are fielding pieces of crap. Is that clear enough to you?"

Take the sophisticated Fox nuclear, biological and chemical detection vehicle. "I can't change a tire on the Fox until the contractor shows up," Honore said. "We have to wait for

some guy in a Jeep Cherokee who is back on the main post or who is downtown."

He complained about the costly cargo-carrying Light Medium Tactical Vehicle, which will run 100 miles without oil. "Why do we want that?" he asked. "The transmission costs \$15,000, while the transmission on the 2 1/2-ton truck costs less than \$1,500. Who cares if it runs without oil?"

He cited a costly trailer that would not leak a drop of water. "Who cares?" he asked. "This is not the Titanic. Why did we overengineer a trailer?"

The answer is an old one: congressmen who continually vote to fund job-creating, big-ticket weapons systems and

skimp on military pay and training. Plus, Pentagon procurement officers who can retire into jobs with defense contractors.

"The first place Congress cuts is personnel, pay, training and travel," says a Senate staffer. "That's the stuff that gets robbed to pay for weapons modernization."

Honore and his colleagues are then left with poorly paid, inadequately trained troops struggling to operate sophisticated, highly engineered technology in the mud and rain. One of his junior officers chimed in by e-mail: "We have an awful lot of gee-whiz technology that cannot survive the rigorous conditions in which

we place it."

Honore warned the Army procurement officers of Henry Ford's advice: "Just because you can do something, don't mean you ought to do it. There's a price that we need to maybe go back and look at, because maybe that sergeant who's on the WIC program

may not be able to use the equipment once you build it."

Yet there is encouraging news in this sad story. For speaking out so honestly, for challenging the military-industrial complex, Honore's fellow officers, even the top brass, regard him as a hero. They know courage when they see it.

Wall Street Journal

May 19, 1998

Pg. 23

Hypocrisy Is The Hallmark Of The Nuclear Flap

By George Melloan

At the wind-up of the G-8 summit in Birmingham Sunday, French President Jacques Chirac issued a stern warning to Pakistan: If you dare to test a nuclear weapon, the G-8 will issue a communiqué "exactly identical to the one we put out on India."

By "exactly identical," which probably sounds less redundant in French, he meant that the G-8 would "express our grave concern." That's what the G-8 lashed India with, so Pakistan had better watch out. No doubt the Paks reacted privately with the same degree of amusement that the Indians were unable to suppress over the posturing by the leaders of "the world's eight leading nations" in response to India's tests.

There is of course nothing funny about nuclear weapons, but the grandstanding in Birmingham had elements of comedy. The assemblage—relying no doubt on the same superb intelligence that had kept them all in the dark about India's testing plans—at one point was led to believe that even during their debate Pakistan had exploded a bomb somewhere. Had someone not set them straight, they might have fired that exactly identical "grave concern" communiqué at Karachi prematurely. The Paks were doing their best, with differing statements from different officials, to confuse the world about whether they in fact will match the tests by their neighboring arch-enemy.

Russian President Boris Yeltsin was among the sumiteers expressing "grave con-

cern." He has been allowed to join the Group of Seven (G-7) leading member nations of the International Monetary Fund, so it now is routinely called the G-8. He can't mix in economic deliberations because Russia is on the IMF dole, but his country still is taken seriously as a military power. That may be because it has 877 nuclear ICBMs, able to strike anywhere in the world. That statistic is from the latest "Military Balance" published by London's International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) and doesn't begin to cover Russia's total capability. Many of its missiles have multiple warheads and it also has 452 submarine-based nukes. Mr. Yeltsin's grave concern apparently doesn't extend to preventing Russian nuclear and missile technology from leaking to would-be nuclear states, if U.S. suspicions are correct.

The world's most populous nation, China, has more than 17 intercontinental and more than 38 intermediate-range nukes, according to the IISS estimate. It also has been accused by the U.S. of selling missile technology to Pakistan among others. And it also has tested its nukes when it pleased, thumbing its nose at the world at large. But Bill Clinton is so friendly with the Chinese that in 1996 he was willing to overrule State Department objections to letting them launch U.S.-made space satellites despite the danger of giving them valuable missile technology, according to reports in the New York Times over the weekend. He also seems to have been less than assiduous about preventing the Chinese from insinuating themselves into the U.S. political process through violations of the U.S. campaign finance laws, judging from testimony by erstwhile go-between and

frequent White House visitor Johnny Chung made public last week.

Given the way the American president treats the two big non-NATO nuclear powers, should it be any surprise that Indian Prime Minister Atal Behari Vajpayee decided to go public with India's nukes? His BJP Hindu nationalist party leads a shaky new governing coalition and he smelled added popularity from showing that India can "stand up," as Mao would have put it. He may have been right. TV footage showed Indians dancing in the streets on hearing the news. Beware of TV scenes, which often are staged, but it is not unbelievable that Indians might think that becoming the world's sixth declared nuclear nation will finally win them some respect.

It hasn't so far, of course. Mr. Clinton's reaction was to slap on sanctions, cutting off U.S. direct aid and threatening to veto further help from the IMF and the World Bank. But it's early times, and Mr. Vajpayee is smart enough to know that a cutoff of outside aid might be just the thing to help him with the politics of installing policies, such as opening the country up to more foreign investment, that will allow India to develop on its own. Just being noticed by those big-time guys in Birmingham and the folks next door in China, he might figure, is almost worth the cost of losing handouts from the U.S., Japan, Canada, Australia and Germany, the countries that have applied sanctions.

What truly upset the folks in Birmingham, and Mr. Clinton especially, was not the fear that India will now shoot nuclear missiles at its neighbors. Two of those neighbors, China and Russia, could annihilate India in response and Pakistan,

probably, could at least retaliate in kind. What troubles the leaders, and much of the global intellectual community, is this further evidence that arms control treaties do not control the spread of modern arms. The two Strategic Arms Limitation Treaties of the Cold War were full of holes and the Russian parliament has not ratified the successor, START II. In the CFE deal limiting conventional weapons in Europe, the U.S.S.R. got a loophole excluding "naval" troops, of which it turned out to have had quite a number who had never set foot on a ship. Iraq has not been at all inhibited by chemical and biological weapons limitations.

Attempting to apply nuclear controls internationally has run afoul of realities. We live in a world of nation states. Those states that do not feel threatened, do not want the expense of nukes and want to enjoy a pretense of virtue, have readily signed onto the antiproliferation and test-ban treaties. India and Pakistan, living in a rough neighborhood unprotected by NATO or other alliances, have put national security ahead of niceties. It's too bad, but that's the way it is.

Bill Clinton had every right to be shocked at this latest mugging by reality. He heads what some choose to call the world's most powerful nation. But it has no defense against nuclear missiles. In the harsh equation of war, the U.S.'s very wealth works against it should it ever be threatened by a poor country with nuclear missiles. It would have a lot more to lose, and even if it suffered a limited attack it would be reluctant to use its vast might against the impoverished masses of the attacking country. Maybe Mr. Clinton should think more about U.S. security.

Berger: Restraint is in Pakistan's interest

As President Clinton and his entourage returned to Washington from Europe Monday night, a weary White House national security adviser Sandy Berger spoke with USA TODAY White House bureau chief Susan Page about the unexpected foreign policy crisis that erupted during the week-long trip. They talked by phone from Air Force One. Berger's comments have been edited for length and clarity.

Q. When President Clinton called Pakistani Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif from London this afternoon, did he make any progress in persuading Pakistan not to conduct nuclear tests?

A. I think the president made the best possible case for why it would be in the interests of Pakistan not to test, and how they could gain the support and approval of the entire world if they resisted the temptation. . . . If they did so, that would very much rebound to their benefit. Having said that, there's enormous public pressure in Pakistan to have a test. The prime minister is under considerable political pressure and public pressure to do so. I think he listened very carefully to what President Clinton and (British) Prime Minister (Tony) Blair had to say and made no commitments.

Q. Are you encouraged that another day has passed without a test?

A. I wouldn't draw too much conclusion from one or two days. But I think time is a good thing here to let emotions subside.

Q. The president says restraint would enhance Pakistan's political, economic and security interests. What specifically is the U.S. offering as incentives?

A. We've had legislation in the United States called the Pressler Amendment, which has almost completely prohibited the United States from providing any assistance to Pakistan. I know from conversations I've had with members of Congress over the last few days there would be considerable support for changing, if not eliminating, the Pressler Amendment. A lot is possible if they forswear a test. But they're going to make this judgment based on

their overall calculation of what's in their interest.

Q. How can you bring India back into the community of nations and persuade it to join the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty if your policy is aimed at isolating India? Don't you need engagement with New Delhi more than ever?

A. We have to make it very clear that the international community sharply condemns this. (But) we don't want to isolate India. It is a very substantial country, the largest democracy in the world, and we continue to have dealings with India. But they have to understand that their standing in the international community has been substantially diminished by this. One action it could take to regain their credibility would be to unconditionally renounce any future testing and sign the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty.

Q. The world already knew that India and Pakistan had nuclear capability. Nuclear tests don't change that fundamental reality. Is it possible we'll be better off dealing with that reality openly?

A. Except that it sets in motion a dynamic in a very tense area of the world. India tests, putting pressure on Pakistan to test, then putting pressure on India to advance the development of its missiles, pushing Pakistan to do the same. And you have an escalation in an enormously tense relationship between two countries that have fought three wars, which means you have an enormous amount of destructive capability on a fairly short trigger.

Q. The president wants India and Pakistan to join the test ban treaty, but his own Senate hasn't ratified it. Is Clinton's weakness with Congress undercutting his ability to act effectively on the world stage?

A. That's a little bit selective. We have just gone through the biggest foreign policy vote of this Congress and perhaps of the past several years: the vote on NATO enlargement, a centerpiece policy of the president. We just submitted the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty this year. The Indian test makes it all the more compelling for Congress to act.

Wall Street Journal (Asia)

May 19, 1998

Pakistan and the Bomb

Pakistan has every reason to be alarmed by India's nuclear tests last week. As Islamabad weighs its options for and against conducting its own test explosion, it also has every reason to see what Pakistan can extract from an anxious world if it shows restraint.

But brinkmanship on that issue can be a risky thing--as we may have seen yesterday when Foreign Minister Gohar Ayub Khan told a wire service reporter that Pakistan is going to test, "it's a matter of when." Since it seems unlikely Pakistan would officially announce its final decision ahead of time, and in interviews, presumably the comment was meant to up the ante in the restraint stakes. Instead, it appears to have helped trigger a rumor at the G-8 meeting in Birmingham, England that Pakistan has already exploded a nuclear device. What makes all the fuss even more distressing is that Pakistan's best deterrent may be the uncertainty about its capabilities.

As we went to press, Pakistan was vigorously denying any

test. Yet it is under several kinds of pressure to do so if it can. The government of Prime Minister Nawaz Sharif may have the largest electoral mandate in Pakistani history, but it will take inspired leadership to explain to a nervous and excitable Pakistani public why their government did not respond to India's provocative gestures. The irrepressible former Prime Minister Benazir Bhutto, under investigation for allegedly exploiting her position to enable millions to flow into family accounts in Switzerland, is now busy exploiting this crisis to urge testing.

There is also the undeniable fact that if Pakistan has the bomb, now may be the best time to see if it actually works. Even calm and rational heads in Islamabad might reason that although a test now would cause an international uproar, the opprobrium would be shared with India and thus diluted. If Pakistan waits to test until some future time, it will create an isolated incident and bear the full brunt of the world's undivided negative attention.

Meanwhile, the tangible benefits and rewards of not strutting its nuclear stuff look pretty meager. Pakistan has said it would be more inclined to refrain from testing if the rest of the world took decisive action against India for its transgression. Not surpris-

ingly, all the G-8 meeting could come up with was an expression of "grave concern" over India's actions. True, sanctions against New Delhi probably wouldn't work any better or more than U.S. sanctions in place against Pakistan since 1990 have prevented Islamabad from enriching more weapons grade plutonium. If no one is willing to make much of a fuss over India, however, what's Pakistan's incentive to take the high moral ground?

As for Washington, with U.S. aid on hold since 1990, it has already exhausted most of its sticks and carrots for dealing with its former Pakistani allies. President Bill Clinton's weekend statement calling the Indian test situation "nutty" was nuttier in its feebleness than the tests themselves. Truly absurd, however, is Washington's reported offer to "reward" Pakistan for not testing by reconsidering the matter of 28 F-16 jets Pakistan bought from the U.S., never delivered because of the anti-nuclear sanctions imposed in 1990. Since Pakistan paid some \$648 million for the jets—all Washington is offering is maybe to refund money that it had no business keeping all this time. Thanks!

If the issue of nuclear proliferation in Southwest Asia is as seriously threatening to world peace as many feel it is, then Washington could do something about it by offering to defend Pakistan in the event of attack. Since that is unlikely, the decision of whether to go forward and test comes back to Pakistan alone.

There are compelling reasons not to. One is the fact that if test preparation rumors continue, India may be encouraged to launch a pre-emptive attack. The infamous false alert of 1990-- caused chiefly by inaccurate reporting about events on the ground in Pakistan--nevertheless raised the possibility of India bombing

Pakistan's nuclear processing facility at Kahuta.

Nothing happened then, and it may not now because--and this should be a crucial factor in Islamabad's calculations--Pakistan already has a nuclear deterrent. The knowledge that it has the capability to make a bomb, and the lack of knowledge about how many and at what sites and how they will be delivered, is already protection. Israel's 1981 pre-emptive strike against Iraq's Osirak plant was the only one of its kind in the nuclear age. Widely condemned, it was an act of anti-proliferation that should have been welcomed by anti-proliferationists everywhere. The important point is that it was possible chiefly because Israel could be sure that Iraq would not retaliate with nuclear force. Nowhere else has that been true, hence no other pre-emptive strikes.

Pakistan is relatively safe now because--unless we make the highly unlikely assumption that India's spies are masterminds--no enemy can calculate whether and how it might be able to retaliate for any kind of attack. It is true, as the Pentagon has argued in opposing absolute test bans, that testing can provide assurance that retaliation for a nuclear attack will be devastatingly effective. But aside from that doomsday calculation, a test doesn't add much to deterrence, and might even detract if it failed to produce the expected big bang.

The biggest mistake, though, would be for Islamabad to play teasing games about whether or not it will test, using interviews or planting newspaper stories about test preparations in the desert near Iran. Such brinkmanship does nothing to add to Pakistan's security and in a worst case scenario could accidentally and fatally compromise it.

Baltimore Sun

May 19, 1998

Pg. 2

Missile-defense debate heats up

■ **Security:** *India's successful nuclear tests sharpen discussion over whether America needs a high-tech system to knock down hostile ballistic missiles.*

By TOM BOWMAN
SUN NATIONAL STAFF

WASHINGTON — Two military tests in widely separated deserts, one a chilling success and the other a persistent failure, have contributed the latest evidence to both sides of a recurring 15-year-old debate:

Should the United States deploy a high-tech umbrella of killer satellites that will shield the states from incoming ballistic missiles?

Ever since Ronald Reagan advanced the Strategic Defense Initiative, a proposal for a space-based national missile-defense program that was dubbed "star wars," the question has alternated between the political wings and center stage every few years, catching the imagination of lawmakers, think tanks and presidential hopefuls.

The proposal has generated

about \$46 billion for development of a national effort and an assortment of spinoffs designed to destroy short-range missiles, ranging from the Navy's ship-borne "Theater Wide Defense" to the Air Force's proposed laser weapon outfitted on a Boeing 747.

So far, there is little progress toward the goal of "a bullet hitting a bullet." A national missile program is still on the drawing board, and the spinoffs are mostly spinning past their intended targets.

The only bullets that seem to be connecting are the verbal ones in the Senate, which failed last week by a single vote to cut off debate, thereby allowing consideration of the "American Missile Protection Act of 1998," a bill that has the support of 50 senators.

Sen. Robert C. Smith, a New Hampshire Republican, says there

is a desperate need for a national missile-defense system. Look no further, he said, than the secret and successful Indian nuclear tests in the state of Rajasthan last week.

"The whole world was caught by surprise — mostly the U.S. intelligence community!" thundered Smith, an ardent supporter of the American Missile Protection Act of 1998, which would put that shield into place as soon as it's "technologically" possible. "How can anyone be opposed to that? It's irresponsible to be opposed to that."

Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle is opposed to that, and believes it's responsible to be opposed.

The South Dakota senator points to an unsuccessful American test as proof that a fast-paced deployment effort isn't possible.

The Army's Theater High-Altitude Area Defense system failed for a fifth consecutive time in a flight test May 11 at White Sands Missile Range, N.M., one day after the Indian success.

"It is now 0-for-5 in tests," Daschle says. The same technology is at the heart of the proposed national missile-defense program, which will cost tens of billions of dollars, says Daschle. Only one country on the horizon poses a possible new ballistic-missile

threat: North Korea. But that country is "on the verge of collapsing on itself," he says.

National missile defense, he concludes, "is unproven, unaffordable and unnecessary."

"This is a bad, untimely idea," echoes Sen. Joseph R. Biden Jr., a Delaware Democrat.

It's not that Biden and the Democrats are against spending tax dollars on developing a missile-defense system. Both parties have supported continued funding and testing. And the Clinton administration — pushed by Republicans — has boosted funding to some \$3.6 billion for the next fiscal year.

They are at odds with Republicans over when and whether to put the missile-defense system in place. Many Republicans want it set up as quickly as possible, while the administration and most Democrats favor the so-called "3-plus-3 plan": Develop in three years — that is, by the year 2000. If, at that point, the intelligence community determines the U.S. is facing a serious threat, the system would be deployed over the following three years.

Most Democrats prefer to move slowly, worrying that any system may violate the 1972 U.S.-Soviet Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty. That treaty strictly limits defensive missile efforts and has been successful in reducing the ballistic-missile arsenal of each side. Antagonizing the Russians may cause them to balk at further cuts, Democrats fear.

Sen. Byron L. Dorgan, a North Dakota Democrat, held aloft a piece of metal from a now-defunct Ukrainian silo during Senate debate last week. "The silo's destroyed. There are now sunflowers

planted," he said. "How did that happen? From arms-control treaties."

"The only real threat to the United States from a ballistic-missile attack remains Russia, which possesses over 6,000 strategic delivery vehicles," says John Isaacs, president of the Council for a Livable World. A treaty "will destroy more Russian ICBMs than even the best missile-defense system."

But the Republicans don't want American defense held hostage by any treaty. And they worry about threats from rogue nations such as Iran, Iraq and North Korea, as well as the new scourge of chemical and biological warheads uncovered by U.N. inspectors in Iraq.

"The Clinton-Gore administration inexplicably refuses to protect the American people from the unthinkable," says Steve Forbes, a once and possible future GOP presidential contender, who is again touting national missile defense. "We have the technology to defend ourselves. The question is: Does Washington have the political will to make it happen?"

Sen. John Kyl, an Arizona Republican, said the surprise Indian nuclear tests show that the intelligence community can't be trusted to keep America informed, as called for in the Clinton plan. "We won't necessarily know when there's a threat," he says.

Despite the intense debate over deployment, a national missile-defense system is still years away. Late last month, the Pentagon chose Boeing to begin crafting the program, awarding a three-year, \$1.6 billion contract.

But the General Accounting Office, Congress' watchdog arm, says even deploying a system by 2003 will be a "significant challenge," given the technical challenges and the limited amount of testing planned. Later this month, the GAO is expected to come out with another report that offers an even more pessimistic review of the risks and costs associated with national missile defense, congressional sources say.

Meanwhile, the shorter-range missiles continue to fail in their own testing. The Navy's Theater Wide Defense system missed the mark twice. And the Army's failed fifth attempt lasted 5.8 seconds — and cost \$12 million.

"That's unfortunate. They're going to have to work harder," says Sen. Thad Cochran, R-Miss., lead sponsor of the American Missile Protection Act. Each missile failure isn't entirely a waste of money for the Pentagon, Cochran contends. "They learn something from every one."

Cochran is convinced that the nuclear tests in India have at last focused the nation's attention on missile defense, which could become a campaign issue in the fall elections. "I don't know how the Democrats are going to explain these votes," he says. "If I were in a close election, I'd find it hard to explain."

He expects to bring a national missile-defense system up for another vote, perhaps as early as next month. By that time, Pakistan may well join India in testing a nuclear device, providing the Republicans with another reason for rapid deployment.

"I'm confident," says Cochran, "we're going to be able to deploy a system."

Washington Post

May 19, 1998

Pg. B5

Five Accused of Damaging B-52

Five peace activists who said they were members of a group called the "Plowsharers" were arrested Sunday after a B-52 bomber was damaged at the annual air show at Andrews Air Force Base, the FBI said yesterday.

Holes were punched in the plane with hammers, and a liquid was poured into it that protesters described as blood, FBI officials said.

The five, who listed their occupations as priests and

nuns, were charged under a federal law that makes damaging an aircraft a crime, said FBI spokesman Larry Faust. He said the incident occurred about 9:30 a.m. while the bomber was on the flight line. No estimate of the damage was available.

The group was detained by Air Force security officers, and the FBI was called in. Those arrested were identified as Frank J. Cordaro, 47, of Lacona, Iowa; Ardeth Platte, 62, of Baltimore; Kathleen A. Boylan, 54, of the District; Lawrence A. Morlan, 38, of Bloomington, Ill.; and Carol Sue Gilbert, 50, of Baltimore.

USA Today

May 19, 1998

Pg. 10

YELTSIN WATCH: A Kremlin spokesman hinted again Monday that President Boris Yeltsin might run for a third term in 2000 — a possibility Yeltsin himself has repeatedly denied. The comment from presidential spokesman Sergei Yastrzhembsky was the latest in a long series of signals from the Kremlin, apparently aimed at testing public attitudes to a possible Yeltsin re-election bid. Other potential candidates include former prime minister Viktor Cherno-

myrdin, Moscow Mayor Yuri Luzhkov, Communist Party leader Gennady Zyuganov, who came in second in the 1996 election, and former national security chief Alexander Lebed. On Sunday, Lebed was elected governor of the large Krasnoyarsk region in Siberia — a job that could be a springboard to the presidency. But Lebed's chances may be ruined if he fails to solve the region's economic woes.

Okinawa lobbies U.S. for base cutbacks

Calls presence too great for small island

By Gus Constantine
THE WASHINGTON TIMES

An Okinawan delegation led by Gov. Masahide Ota, frustrated by Japan's failure to address its concerns over U.S. military bases on the island, is appealing to the United States as a "matter of conscience" to reduce its presence there.

In an interview yesterday with reporters and editors of The Washington Times, Mr. Ota said the United States should "consider relocating to areas outside the prefecture, especially to places like Guam or Hawaii." He said the delegation will meet with State Department officials to press the point home.

"It is a question of fairness. Okinawa should not bear so much of the burden to provide security for the region," said the governor of Japan's southernmost prefecture, an island chain about halfway between the rest of Japan and Taiwan.

Mr. Ota said appeals to Japan's central government failed because Tokyo is concerned about public opposition in the other 46 prefectures, which are more populous

and have bigger parliamentary delegations. The American bases are a "not my back yard" problem, he said.

The governor was accompanied by three Okinawan mayors, who said U.S. military facilities in their cities cause safety and environmental problems associated with military activities in congested urban areas. The American bases occupy 20 percent of Okinawa's limited land area, choking off investment and hampering economic development, Mr. Ota and members of his delegation said.

The governor said Okinawa objects to a Special Action Committee on Okinawa (SACO) report issued in December 1996 that calls for returning to Okinawa land used by 11 U.S. bases, including the huge Futenma Marine Corps Air Station, but only if replacement facilities are found on the island.

"Okinawa already carries a disproportional shares of the burden of hosting the American bases," Mr. Ota said, pointing out that 75 percent of the land used by U.S. military installations in Japan is on Okinawa.

The SACO recommendations came in response to public outrage

over the Sept. 4, 1995, abduction and rape of a 12-year-old Okinawa schoolgirl by an American sailor and two U.S. Marines.

In its final report, the committee recommended the return of land at 11 bases and the replacement of Futenma MCAS, which occupies the center of the city of Ginowan with an offshore, floating heliport.

The United States agreed, but only if the facilities were relocated to other sites in Okinawa. Communities selected as potential sites strongly criticize the precondition.

For example, Mr. Ota pointed out that in December, a majority of voters in the town of Nago voted against putting the floating heliport that would replace Futenma MCAS off their shore.

Mr. Ota said his government decided not to accept the recommendations but fight them with central authorities in Tokyo and in the United States.

However, both national governments consider the U.S. bases on Okinawa central to carrying out their strategic defense objectives, and Tokyo already bears most of the financial cost.

USA Today

May 19, 1998

Pg. 10

N. KOREA KEEPS REMAINS: North Korea is refusing to turn over the remains of what are believed to be two Americans missing in action from the Korean War, putting in jeopardy the one area of U.S.-North Korean cooperation that has been proceeding smoothly in recent years. Eight sets of U.S. remains have been recovered previously by joint teams, and U.S. veterans' groups had high hopes for

five recovery missions scheduled this year. But on Friday, the North Koreans balked at handing over two sets to the U.N. command that polices the demilitarized zone separating the two Koreas. The United States responded by putting on hold a visit to North Korea by a U.S. archival mission, a senior administration official said. More than 8,100 U.S. soldiers are officially still listed as MIA from the 1950-53 conflict.

— Barbara Slavin

Baltimore Sun

May 19, 1998

Pg. 9

Russian combat troops join first NATO exercise

COPENHAGEN, Denmark —

Russian combat troops took part in their first North Atlantic Treaty Organization exercise yesterday, a two-week drill in Denmark simulating a peacekeeping operation.

The goal of the exercise in and

around Frederikshavn — 170 miles northwest of the capital, Copenhagen — was to keep the peace in a country suffering ethnic strife and the breakdown of order, requiring the evacuation of civilians.

Wall Street

Journal

May 19, 1998

Pg. 1

Arāfat met with Secretary of State Albright in hastily arranged talks in London, but no accord was reached. The unexpected meeting had spurred hopes for progress

toward reviving talks with Israel. Separately, Netanyahu denied a report he had accepted a U.S. West Bank-pullout plan.

CURRENT NEWS SERVICE
ROOM 4C881, PENTAGON, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301-7500
Tel: (703)695-2884 / 697-8765 Fax: (703)695-6822/7260

CHIEF: Richard Oleszewski NEWS DIRECTOR: Taft Phoebus EARLY BIRD EDITOR: Linda Lee

EDITORS: Elmer Christian, Erik Erickson, Janice Goff, Meredith Johnson

SYSTEMS ADMINISTRATOR: Carol Rippe ADMINISTRATION: Wendy Powers PRODUCTION: Defense Automated Printing Service (Room 3A1037)